NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

AN INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY FOR NEW TESTAMENT AND RELATED STUDIES BASED ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Vol. IV OCTOBER 1960 Fasc. 3

B. M. F. VAN IERSEL, The finding of Jesus in the temple . . . 161
CECIL ROTH, The cleansing of the temple and Zechariah . . . 174
M. DE JONGE, Christian influence in the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs . . . 182
ERNEST BEST, Spirit-Baptism . . . 236
BOOK REVIEW . . . 243

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1960

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

AN INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY FOR NEW TESTAMENT AND RELATED STUDIES BASED ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

EDITORIAL BOARD:

President: W. C. VAN UNNIK, Utrecht, Netherlands.

Members: P. BRATSIOTIS, Athens, Greece; H. CLAVIER, Strasbourg, France; K. W. CLARK, Durham N.C., U.S.A.; A. DESCAMPS, Louvain, Belgium; J. W. DOEVE, Musselkanaal (Gron.), Netherlands; J. DORESSE, Fontenay-aux-Roses (Seine), France; C. W. DUGMORE, Manchester, Great Britain; DOM JAC. DUPONT O.S.B., Brugge, Belgium; A. GEYSER, Pretoria, South Africa; W. GROSSOUW, Nijmegen, Netherlands; PH. H. MENOUD, Neuchâtel, Switzerland; BO REICKE, Basle, Switzerland; P. SCHUBERT, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A.; E. STAUFFER, Erlangen, Germany.

EDITORIAL STAFF:

Professor W. C. VAN UNNIK, Utrecht, The Netherlands;
Dr. J. W. DOEVE, *Secretary*, Marktstraat 13, Musselkanaal, The Netherlands, telephone: Musselkanaal 2886, to whom all manuscripts and books for review should be addressed.

The publisher is E. J. BRILL, Leiden, The Netherlands, to whom subscriptions may be sent. The price is Gld. 26.— a year.

THE FINDING OF JESUS IN THE TEMPLE

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ORIGINAL FORM OF LUKE ii 41-51a

BY

B. VAN IERSEL

H. Landstichting 14, Nijmegen

I.

The story of the finding of Jesus in the temple, Luke ii 41-51a [1]), is according to R. BULTMANN "eine ursprüngliche Einzelgeschichte, die die vorangegangenen nicht voraussetzt". The story has two points, viz. "1. die überraschende Weisheit des jugendlichen Jesus (V. 47); 2. sein Weilen im Tempel, das seine religiöse Bestimmung kundtut" [2]). The story may have originated in Christian-Hellenistic circles of Jewish origin [3]), whereas its central theme [4]) has possibly been taken from pagan Hellenism and applied to Jesus [5]). About the nature of the story he writes elsewhere: "Dass die Gestalt Jesu unter dem Gesichtspunkt des Glaubens, des Kultus und des Mythos gesehen wird, das ist auch der Grund dafür, dass diese Gestalt nicht zum Gegenstand der eigentlichen Heiligenlegenden geworden ist. Es fehlen Geschichten, die ihn als Muster frommer Lebensführung darstellen . . ., das Interesse an seinem Βίος fehlt nicht nur im Sinne der Historie, sondern auch im Sinne der Heiligenverehrung. Eine Ausnahme ist nur die Geschichte vom zwölfjährigen Jesus Lk 2, 41-52 . . ." [6]). Accordingly this story would be the only specimen of a legend.

M. DIBELIUS holds a similar view. To his opinion the narrative is a typical case of a "Personallegende", i.e. a story about a person who, on account of his exceptional virtue or holiness, is particularly

---

[1]) Cf. the bibliography in R. LAURENTIN, *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II*, Paris 1957, 189-226. To my knowledge there are no other important works that should be added to this list, exc. A. S. GEYSER, *The Youth of John the Baptist*, *NT* 1 (1956) 70-75.

[2]) *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen 1958⁴, 327.

[3]) *Op. cit.*, 330.

[4]) B. does not specify which of the two themes is the main motive of the *pericopa*.

[5]) *Op. cit.*, 331.

[6]) *Op. cit.*, 334.

privileged by God [1]). Jesus is represented here as the acme of piety, because He surpasses his parents' piety in staying longer in the temple than they did [2]). The legendary structure shows at the same time that the origin of the story does not lie in the milieu of preaching but in the milieu of story-telling. Since the story represents Jesus as an example to be imitated [3]), its religious value is in its edifying character.

In the following a critical analysis of the text will put these statements to the test, and at the same time serve as a starting-point for some observations pointing to another direction.

2.

Is it probable that originally the story existed in the tradition as an "Einzelgeschichte"?

From the purely formal point of view the passage stands out from its context, and is separated from it by a framework that makes it fit into the whole of Luke i-iii. The editorial seams are easily visible. On one side it is v. 40, and on the other v. 51c-52. Both verses are akin to i 80, and form a kind of inclusion, a frame in its literal sense. They do not only correspond with each other, but are also in keeping with the narrative in between them, because one of its two themes, the σύνεσις of young Jesus, re-echoes in both the frame-verses, in either of which his σοφία is emphasized [4]).

Within this editorial framework [5]) (to which v. 51c belongs too) [6]),

---

[1]) *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Tübingen 1933², 101-102.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, 103-106.

[3]) *Op. cit.*, 128-129.

[4]) This naturally raises the question why σοφία is used in the framework, and σύνεσις in v. 47. Σοφία is doubtless a loftier word than σύνεσις and is also used in relation to God, whereas the latter in the New Testament means a specifically human knowledge. For the rest both words are not unfrequently synonymous: Mt. xi 25 par; 1 Cor. i 19; Col. i 19; ii 2-3. Why v. 47 has σύνεσις could be explained by οὐ συνῆκαν in v. 50. So the σύνεσις of young Jesus is contrasted with the lack of σύνεσις of his parents. As a result of the use of σοφία in the framework instead of σύνεσις, the ordinary 'intelligence' is put on a level more in keeping with the other things that are said of Jesus in these frame-verses.

[5]) It is still open to question what does and what does not belong to the editorial frame. DIBELIUS e.g. *op. cit.*, 103ff., thinks that v. 50 belongs to the editorial framework, since it does not fit in with a legend "die auf einem beglückenden Schluss hinausläuft".

[6]) The information about Jesus' mother certainly belongs to it. As to how far v. 51b, καὶ ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς, belongs to the editorial framework or the original story, is doubtful. The word ὑποτάσσειν does not

he story itself begins and ends with verses that are related to ne another: a) v. 41 καὶ ἐπορεύοντο . . . εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ contrasts ith v. 51 καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρέθ; b) v. 42 ἀναβαινόντων αὐτῶν ith v. 51 καὶ κατέβη μετ' αὐτῶν [1]). Thus the story itself, being ircumscribed by two corresponding verses, is made into a formal nit.

These points are undoubtedly positive indications to justify the ypothesis that Luke ii 41-51a is "eine ursprüngliche Einzel-eschichte".

The same holds true, if we examine the relation of Luke ii 1-51a to Luke i 5-ii 39. For the latter forms a well-defined struc-ure [2]), in which there is no place for the end of the second chapter, hat, therefore, is generally held to be an epilogue [3]). Considering he difference of style and the lack of traces of a Hebrew original [4]), R. LAURENTIN thinks it quite probable that the *pericopa* in question s "une pièce plus tardive [5]), ajoutée après coup" [6]).

---

ccur in the gospels but in Lk., and is much used by Paul. Since the original tory itself was rewritten by Luke (cf. pp. 166-167), it is, however, impos-ible to derive anything definite from this.

[1]) Probably the change of subject is not due to mere coincidence. In the rst part (vv. 41-45) Jesus' parents are the principal characters, whereas rom v. 47 onwards Jesus himself is the centre of the story. V. 46 forms he transition.

[2]) Cf. for the structure R. LAURENTIN, *op. cit.*, 23-42, where also the views f E. BURROWS, P. GÄCHTER and S. LYONNET are summarized.

[3]) Cf. e.g. R. LAURENTIN, *op. cit.*, 33 and 141. A. GEYSER, *op. cit.*, holds, owever, that the story of the finding in the temple formed part of a written ource containing the parallel narratives of Jesus and the Baptist. The lack f a parallel of Lk ii 41-51a in the story of the Baptist would be a "break in he parallel account of the Lucan infancy story". Accordingly G. tries to econstruct the subject-matter of this missing part. To my opinion the paral-elism is broken not because a section was left out, but because ii 41-51a was dded.

[4]) This is disputable. There are first the two hebraisms καὶ ἐγένετο and ν τῷ with the infin., which are frequent with Lk., and occur here likewise. But one could also point out the fact that the story in spite of a number of articiples, v. 44, 45 (bis), 46 (terties), 47, 48 (bis), and a gen. absol., 42-43, ontinues to show a very paratactic structure. Nearly all the sentences tart with καὶ, followed immediately, or almost immediately, by the verb; nly twice another conjunction is used, viz. in v. 44 and v. 47. For this eason I would not be too positive about the non-Hebrew origin of the story.

[5]) I would not be so certain about this. If our hypothesis is correct, the *ericopa* though added later, is older than the component parts of the rest f Lk. i-ii. This might be corroborated by the fact that Jesus' virgin-birth s in no way supposed here.

[6]) *Op. cit.*, 141-142.

There is indeed an important difference of style and inspiration, first because the midrash-character of Luke i 5-ii 39 [1]) is wanting here [2]), and secondly because this is the only story in these chapters that does not owe its impulse and spiritual impact to the words of heavenly messengers [3]) or prophets [4]), but to a word of Jesus himself.

Finally, it is of great importance that this story, as R. BULTMANN has rightly pointed out, "die vorangegangenen nicht voraussetzt, wie besonders V. 48 und 50 zeigen, wo die Eltern noch keine Ahnung von der Bedeutung des Kindes verraten" [5]). In order to understand it the reader need not be acquainted with the preceding parts of the Birth-Stories. Moreover, it is very well possible that the isolated story was part of the tradition before the primitive church had become conscious of Jesus' virgin-birth and its implications, to which Matthew i and Luke i—doubtless more recent compositions—bear witness so evidently [6]).

BULTMANN's opinion as to the isolated pre-existence of Luke ii 41-51a in the tradition before it was incorporated into Luke i-ii is, consequently, borne out by an analysis of the text.

3.

Is this also the case with his opinion that Luke ii 41-51a is a typical specimen of a legend? We cannot but admit that the story shows some characteristics of a novel or legend, and that it belongs to the genre of story-telling rather than catechetical instruction. In this connexion two things need mentioning.

The first is the great interest taken in the human side of the events. The description of the search of Jesus is packed with details, and especially v. 44 presents us with a number of particulars that are irrelevant to the preacher or catechist, but are of paramount

---

[1]) Cf. for this R. LAURENTIN, *op. cit.*, 43-119.

[2]) LAURENTIN's reference, *op. cit.*, 142, to Mal. iii 1, seems to be far-fetched. It is a matter rather of *staying* in the temple than of *coming* into the temple, and it would, therefore, be more obvious to think of young Samuel (1 Sam. ii), to which the framework clearly refers, although there are no references or allusions in the story itself and both the situations differ completely.

[3]) i 11-20, 26-38, ii 9-12, 13-14.

[4]) Elisabeth i 41, Zachary i 67, Simeon ii 25, 26, 27, Anna ii 36.

[5]) *Op. cit.*, 327. Up to now it has never been proved convincingly that this episode excludes Jesus' virgin-birth.

[6]) Cf. p. 163 n. 5.

importance to the narrator, who wants to enliven his story and to represent the scene in clear and vivid terms. It is also notable that so much attention is being paid to the feelings of the persons concerned (v. 47, 48a and 48b), and that the text shows a great interest in the minor actors, Jesus' parents (v. 41-45).

The other remarkable fact is the profane character of v. 47, which would be appropriate to a narrative but not to a piece of ecclesiastical catechesis. The audience is amazed at Jesus' σύνεσις and his answers. The best translation for this Greek word is 'intelligence' [1]), for there is nothing in the context to suggest that Jesus' σύνεσις is of a religious nature [2]). The whole sentence should, therefore, be translated: 'all those who heard him were amazed at his intelligent answers'. The profane character of v. 47 is also manifest in the reactions of the listeners, and can only be realized to the full if one compares the verse with similar synoptic passages in which the reactions to a pronouncement or miracle of Jesus are recorded [3]). Far more often than not these reactions are of a religious character, e.g.: people praise God [4]) or fall down at Jesus' feet [5]), and in one case a man who has been cured sets out to proclaim the Lord [6]). In most cases people are said to be

---

[1]) How neutral the meaning of σύνεσις really is appears from Mk. xii 33 (a quotation from Dt. vi 5, where σύνεσις is the translation of נפש; in the LXX נפש is never rendered in this way) and from 1 Cor. i 19, where it is used in a derogatory sense (cf. also Mt. xi 25 par., where the adj. συνετός has the same meaning). The meaning 'intelligence' is similar to the use of συνετός in Acts xiii 7, where Luke calls Sergius Paulus 'an intelligent man'. The noun σύνεσις is everywhere else specified (Eph. iii 4, Col. i 9, ii 2, 2 Tim. ii 7). The verb συνιέναι is frequently used in the synoptic tradition to signify that one does *not* understand the Lord: Mt. xiii 13 parr., the quotation in Mt. xiii 14-15 (cf. also Acts xxviii 26), Mt. xiii 19. It is also used to denote the fact that one *does* understand: Mt. xiii 23 par., xv 10 par., xvi 12, Mk. viii 17, 21. Besides in viii 10 and xxiv 25, Luke also uses it in xviii 34, after the third prediction of Jesus' passion. After the second prediction he uses ἀγνοεῖν (ix 45), in correspondence with Mk. ix 32.

[2]) The διδάσκαλοι speak of course about religious subjects in the temple, particularly about the Torah. But this is the very σύνεσις τῶν συνετῶν which is rejected.

[3]) Mk. i 22 parr., i 27 par., ii 12 parr., iv 41 parr., v 20, v 42 parr., vi 51 par., vii 37 par., x 24-32, xi 18, xii 17 parr., xv 5 par., Mt. ix 33 par., xii 23, xxii 33, Lk. ii 18, iv 22, ix 43. Sometimes they also occur in the middle of a *pericopa*: Mk. v 15, vi 2 par., Mt. xxi 20, Lk. i 21, 63, ii 33, xxiv 37, 41.

[4]) Mk. ii 12 parr., Mt. xv 31.

[5]) Lk. v 8, Mt. xiv 33.

[6]) Mk. v 20.

overcome with awe and fear in the presence of the superhuman [1]). The *pericopae* that compare best with the description given in Luke ii 47 are those which inform us of people's amazement at Jesus' teaching [2]). But even then there are a few striking differences. In Luke ii 47 Jesus does not act as a διδάσκαλος, but on the contrary as a disciple, who 'sits, listens and asks questions' [3]). Moreover, there is no other text in which people are said to be amazed at his 'intelligence'. One gets the impression that young Jesus is depicted here as a sort of child prodigy, who strikes his listeners by his unusual intelligence. This motive is nowhere to be found in the catechetical tradition; it is legendary rather than anything else, and occurs quite frequently in the apocrypha [4]).

Accordingly, one cannot easily deny the legendary, or at least novellistic, character of the story. It is worth noticing that the novellistic characteristics, though not altogether absent from the rest of the text, are concentrated in v. 44 and 47.

4.

There is, however, a serious objection against the view that Luke inserted this novellistic or legendary story between the Birth-Stories and the body of his gospel, in such a form as he had found it in the tradition. Luke's text bears unmistakable evidence of his authorship. Of the 67 words which R. MORGENTHALER mentions in his list of Lukan words [5]), no less then 13 occur in Luke ii 41-51a, viz.: πορεύεσθαι, ἔτος, Ἰερουσαλήμ, γίνεσθαι,

---

[1]) Mk. iv 41 parr., v 15, vi 51 par., vii 37, x 24-32, Mt. ix 33 par., xii 23, xxi 20, Lk. iv 22, ix 43, xxiv 37, 41.

[2]) Mk. i 22 parr., i 27 par., vi 2, Mt. xxii 33.

[3]) K. BORNHÄUSER, *Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie* II/23, 140, holds that the fundamental differences between Jesus and the scribes already emerged at this first meeting. That would be the explanation of their astonishment at Jesus' answers. In this hostile atmosphere he would have been found by his parents, and that would have been the reason why they were frightened. However interesting this opinion may be, there is nothing in the text to support it. The attitude towards Jesus described by ἐξίσταντο ... ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει ... αὐτοῦ, seems to have been more favourable than BORNHÄUSER supposes.

[4]) Cf. esp. the apocryphon about the Childhood of Jesus, attributed to Thomas, ed. E. HENNECKE-W. SCHNEEMELCHER, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, I, Tübingen 1959, 293-298. Cf. for an English edition W. HAYES, *The gospel according to Thomas*, 1921.

[5]) *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*, Zürich-Frankfurt am Main 1958, 181.

ἡμέρα, ὑποστρέφειν, ζητεῖν, εὑρίσκειν, μέσος, ἐρωτᾶν, πρός, δεῖ, ῥῆμα. Out of a total of 170 words in the passage, 22 belong to this list, which means a proportion of 22:170, or more than 1:8. Besides, a number of other words are more or less characteristic of Luke [1]):

	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	John	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	elsewhere
γονεῖς	1	1	6	6	—	6	—	—
κατά	37	23	43	8	90	194	41	35
ἔθος	—	—	3	1	7	—	1	—
ὑπομένειν (stay on) [2])	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—
νομίζειν	3	—	2	—	7	3	—	—
ἀναζητεῖν	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—
γνωστός [3])	—	—	2	2	10	1	—	—
infin. εἶναι	6	8	23	3	20	54	3	8
ἱερόν	11	9	14	10	25	1	—	—
ἐξιστάναι	1	4	3	—	8	1	—	—
ἐπί	120	73	160	33	165	131	30	166
δύνασθαι	—	—	3	—	1	—	—	—

Including these the total number of typically Lukan words amounts to 43: 170, which is a little more than 1: 4.

Finally one could point out the expressions κατὰ τὸ ἔθος [4]) and τί ὅτι [5]), which are exclusively Lukan, and ἐν τῷ with the infinitive [6]), καὶ ἐγένετο [7]) and ἐν μέσῳ [8]), which are more frequent with Luke than with Mark and Matthew.

In the light of these data we have to accept the fact that Luke either composed the whole story himself or at least rewrote an account he had found in the tradition.

---

[1]) The statistical data are from R. MORGENTHALER, *op. cit.*

[2]) So A. PLUMMER, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the gospel according to S. Luke*, Edinburgh 1956[5], 75.

[3]) Usually the neuter γνωστόν; for persons only in Lk. ii 44, xxiii 49, John xviii 15, 16.

[4]) Viz. i 9, ii 42, xxii 39. Cf. A. PLUMMER, *op. cit.*, 10.

[5]) M. J. LAGRANGE, *Évangile selon Saint Luc*, Paris 1948[7], 96, refers also to Lk. iv 36; F. BLASS-A. DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen 1954[9], Nr. 298, thinks that it is an abbrev. of τί γέγονεν ὅτι (John xiv 22), and F. M. ABEL, *Grammaire du Grec biblique*, Paris 1927, § 35 l, of τί ποτέ ἐστιν ὅτι.

[6]) Cf. F. M. ABEL, *op. cit.*, § 70 g; F. BLASS-A. DEBRUNNER, *op. cit.*, Nr. 404.

[7]) Cf. A. PLUMMER, *op. cit.*, 75; M. J. LAGRANGE, *op. cit.*, XLVII-XLIX.

[8]) Cf. A. PLUMMER, *op. cit.*, 218-219.

5.

The choice between a story written by Luke himself on the one hand, and a story adapted by him from a written source or an oral tradition on the other, cannot be decided in favour of the latter unless we are able to prove convincingly that Luke ii 41-51a, as it stands now, is uneven with regard to subject-matter or form. And indeed, the actual version of the story is unsatisfactory in both respects.

As for the contents there is a certain lack of balance in the account, which is due to the fact that the story has two points. These are, according to BULTMANN: "1. die überraschende Weisheit des jugendlichen Jesus (V. 47); 2. sein Weilen im Tempel, das seine religiöse Bestimmung kundtut" [1]). And he adds: "Beide Motive sind immerhin so verwandt, dass die Annahme, sie hätten einmal isoliert in literarischer Fassung existiert, nicht notwendig ist" [2]). But is this definition of the two motives correct? The second and main motive is obviously concerned with Jesus' stay in the temple, but its real point is the opposition between the one Jesus' mother calls ὁ πατήρ σου (v. 48), and the one Jesus himself calls, without transition, ὁ πατήρ μου (v. 49). The dialogue between Jesus and his mother (v. 48-49) stresses this opposition as strongly as possible, and states firmly that Jesus' belonging to God, his Father, is his only rule of conduct. In this saying of Jesus (v. 49) centres the main interest of the second motive. The first (v. 47) is only of secondary importance. And if Jesus dissociates himself from his father in order to make clear that God is his Father, is it then still correct to say that both the motives of the story are in a direct line with each other? Are the boy's σύνεσις and his sonship of the divine Father related to one another? Apparently, Jesus' parents do not understand anything of his exclusive relationship with God, which is expressed by the words οὐ συνῆκαν (v. 50). Thus Jesus' σύνεσις and his parents' lack of σύνεσις are somehow opposed to each other. But this does not necessarily mean that both have the same object, viz. Jesus' relationship with his heavenly Father. For in case the boy would have spoken about that in the temple, the διδάσκαλοι would certainly have been horrified at his pretensions instead of being astonished at his intelligence [3]).

[1]) *Op. cit.*, 327.
[2]) *Ad loc.*
[3]) In that case it would be right to describe the situation in the sense of K. BORNHÄUSER. Cf. p. 166 n. 3.

Actually, in the story Jesus' σύνεσις is not connected with his particular relation to God, but with something else. There is, consequently, no connection between the two motives of the story [1]).

The opposite is more likely. The theme of v. 47 is totally absent from the catechesis of the primitive church, whereas that of v. 49 is there of considerable importance [2]). Moreover, the first motive diverts the reader's attention from the logion, and so weakens the total effect of the story. This warrants the supposition that the theme of v. 47 was interpolated during a later stage of the tradition. In any case, on account of its double motive the structure of the story is neither well-balanced nor altogether clear, and this fact needs explaining.

There is, indeed, a flaw in the narrative showing that the present version of the story is an adaptation. The subject of v. 47 is πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ. The sentence runs on in v. 48, so that, at least from the point of view of syntax, we are supposed to read both sentences as having the same subject: 'all those hearing him were amazed at his intelligence and answers, and seeing him were astonished'. One gets the impression that at first they only heard him, without yet seeing him. Quite rightly this verse is generally held to refer to his parents [3]). But one does not seem to be sufficiently aware of the fact that the syntax does not allow of this interpretation. The only way out of the difficulty is to drop v. 47. In that case the subject of v. 43 and of all the following sentences, οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, would also be the subject of v. 48. With this corresponds a flaw in the subject-matter. In v. 47 Jesus is said to be listening and asking questions. In v. 48, however, one is amazed, not at his questions, but at his answers, which have not been mentioned.

The very fact that both the flaw in the subject-matter and the one in the syntax have reference to the same verse, and so confirm

---

[1]) This does not, of course, simply imply that the two motives have existed in the tradition in a form which R. BULTMANN calls "literarischer Fassung".

[2]) The really ultimate point of the motive seems to be that Jesus cannot be understood and comprehended as long as one judges him by his antecedents and milieu. This idea recurs in the catechetical tradition in several forms, particularly in the logia in which Jesus dissociates himself from his relatives, and declares explicitly that consanguinity does not matter, because those who believe in him are his relatives: Mk. iii 20-21, 31-35 parr., Mk. vi 2-4 parr., Lk. xi 27-28, John ii 4, vii 3-10.

[3]) PLUMMER, *op. cit.* 77; LAGRANGE seems to take it so much for granted that he does not mention it.

one another, should not be underestimated. It follows as a matter of course that v. 47 is to be regarded as a secondary addition to the story, which implies that the story originally had one point only, viz. the logion of v. 49.

6.

It has gradually become clear that Luke ii 41-51a is indeed an adapted version of an original "Einzelgeschichte", which presumably originated from the catechetical tradition [1]). What then was the original form of the story, and what was being added in the process of its adaptation? We have come to the conclusion that Luke must have rewritten the story completely [2]), but it is of course not possible for us to restore the original. The matter is too complicated for that. Nevertheless, there are a few verses of which the secondary character can be easily demonstrated, and which therefore may be left out.

Starting with v. 47, of which the secondary character has already become clear, we may suppose that it was added by Luke himself on the analogy of similar editorial verses which are firmly rooted in synoptic passages containing a logion or miracle of Jesus [3]). This presumption can be corroborated by Luke xx 26, the only text of the synoptic tradition which states explicitly and in terms remindful of Luke ii 47 that people were amazed at an answer of Jesus: καὶ θαυμάσαντες ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκρίσει αὐτοῦ ἐσίγησαν. The word ἀπόκρισις does not occur anywhere else in the synoptic tradition, and only twice in the rest of the New Testament, viz. in John i 22, xix 9. On the other hand, supposing Luke himself has added the verse, we are left with the problem why he did not

---

[1]) Unlike the kerygmatic phase of the tradition which concentrates on Jesus' death and resurrection, the catechetical phase is much more interested in his life, i.e. his words and miracles, by which one can enter into the meaning of Jesus and his mission.

[2]) Even the logion may have been tampered with, as might appear from the presence of δεῖ, for which Lk is known to have a predilection. Cf. H. Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, Tübingen 1960³, 141-144. The word also occurs in the other parts of the synoptic tradition. The divine 'must' which is expressed by the impersonal form of this verb, is in this tradition connected either with Jesus' passion and death (Mk viii 31 parr.) or with the eschatological events (Mk ix 11 parr., xiii 7 parr., xiii 10). There does not seem to be here a direct connexion with either of them.

[3]) Cf. p. 165 n. 3.

smooth away the resulting syntactic irregularity between v. 47 and v. 48 [1]).

The presence of v. 44 may also be due to Luke's interference. The Lukan words are particularly numerous in this verse [2]). Moreover, the details show a novellistic tendency, and the account of the search is rather circumstantial, while the repetition of the verb ἀναζητεῖν in v. 44 and v. 45 deepens the impression that the verse is a detailed and novellistic elaboration of what in v. 48 is said about the anxious search of Jesus' parents. Such novellistic elaborations are not uncommon with Luke [3]).

A curious detail seems to verify this hypothesis. Luke has evidently tried to change the original paratactic structure of the narrative into a more syntactic one [4]). His attempt, however, has not been quite successful. For all the sentences start with καὶ, followed immediately or almost immediately by the verb [5]). The only two exceptions are the verses 44 and 47, which are linked with the preceding verses by the particle δέ. As above it is a formal criterion

---

[1]) There are three possibilities: 1. This addition is not by Lk, but by somebody before him, in which case the irregularity resulting from the process of adaptation would have been overlooked by Luke. 2. The addition is by Luke; but having been interpolated rather clumsily it is still easily recognizable as such. 3. The addition is by Luke or somebody else, but after the adaptation had been made.

The curious thing, however, is that there are strong objections against each of the three possibilities, and it is therefore still very much an open question as to what exactly happened. This uncertainty, however, does not justify the conclusion that v. 47 has always formed part of the story.

[2]) Νομίζειν; εἶναι; συνοδία is a *hapaxlegomenon*, but the verb συνοδεύειν occurs only once, viz. Acts ix 7; if we take into account Luke's preference for the prep. σύν and for the verbs with the prefix συν, we may consider this noun as a Lukanism too. Cf. the tables in R. MORGENTHALER, *op. cit.*, 160; ἡμέρα; ἀναζητεῖν; συγγενεύς (this word recurs only twice, viz. here and in Mk vi 4, but συγγενής occurs in Lk i 58, xiv 12, xxi 16, Acts x 24; once in John and four times in Paul; and συγγένεια only in Lk i 61 and Acts vii 3, 14); γνωστός. These are all the verbs but one (ἦλθον) and all the nouns but one (ὁδός).

[3]) Cf. the following specimens, which belong to the Lukan *Sondergut*,: vii 11-17, vii 36-viii 3, xix 1-10, xxiii 6-12, xxiv 13-35, and from texts Lk has in common with the others, esp. Lk iv 16-30 (esp. v. 17, 20, 29), v. 18-19, vii 1-10. It is hardly a coincidence that BULTMANN in the chapter on the technique of the story, takes most of his examples from Lk, *op. cit.* 335-346.

[4]) As appears from the many participles and the two genitivi absoluti (cf. p. 163 n. 4).

[5]) This points to a Hebrew original (see p. 163 n. 4).

again which confirms what has been put forward as a hypothesis on account of the subject-matter [1]).

7.

Although it is not possible for us to restore the exact wording of the original story, we might venture to say a few things about its original shape. If we take the story out of its framework (v. 40, 51b-52) and drop the verses 44 and 47, we are left with a unit that has all the structural qualities of the synoptic *pericopa* which DIBELIUS has called a *Paradigma*, BULTMANN an *Apophthegma*, and English scholars a pronouncement-story. The formal features of this kind of pattern may be summarized as follows [2]):

a. The text is concise and sober.
b. At the beginning and at the end it is rounded off with literary devices (v. 41-42 καὶ ἐπορεύοντο ... εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ ... καὶ ... ἀναβαινόντων αὐτῶν v. 51 καὶ κατέβη μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρέθ).
c. The narrative supplies a brief sketch of the situation, which generally has an introductory function (v. 41-43, 45-46).
d. At the end usually stands the logion or the dialogue which transcending the particular situation, is the real point of the story (v. 49).
e. The logion is often followed up by a summary account of the reactions either of the listeners or of the participants of the dialogue (v. 50).

The paradigmatic form of the original narrative is not without importance. It shows that the primitive story was neither legendary nor novellistic. At the same time it makes clear that the story has its *Sitz im Leben* in the catechetical instruction, and it makes it probable that Luke ii 41-51a, in its paradigmatic form, belongs to a primitive stage of the tradition, which, also according to BULTMANN and DIBELIUS, provides us with the most reliable

---

[1]) It is notable, however, that v. 51c begins also with καὶ, whereas in v. 19 the same information is connected with the foregoing by δὲ. V. 52 starts with καὶ too, whereas the related texts i 80 and ii 40 make the connexion with δὲ. It is possible that Lk, being under the influence of his source, unconsciously continued to use καὶ.

[2]) Cf. M. DIBELIUS, *op. cit.*, 34-66; R. BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, 66-72.

nformation about Jesus that can be derived from the synoptic gospels.

The purport of the original *paradigma* coincides with that of the present version of the story, but with all attention being focussed on the short dialogue of vv. 48-49 it probably came there more to the fore. The fact that the logion is not quite clear in its details is due to the problematic ἐν τοῖς [1]). Of one thing, however, we may be sure, viz. that the real issue of the story is the opposition between Jesus' putative father (Luke iii 23) and his real Father, as is clear from the formal opposition in vv. 48-49, where the boy Jesus dissociates himself clearly from Joseph and declares that he must be in 'the affairs' or 'the house' of his real Father [2]).

The *paradigma* and the logion are related with other fragments of the catechetical tradition, particularly with those in which Jesus is said to dissociate himself from his family [3]). The problem of Joseph's fatherhood is sensed in texts such as Matthew xiii 55 par. and John vi 42. But there is not one logion in the gospels that deals with it explicitly, unless we are to take the saying of Matthew xi 27 as to have originally been the answer to the question of Matthew xiii 54-56, as we have proposed elsewhere [4]).

---

[1]) Cf. P. Temple, *What is to be understood by* ἐν τοῖς (Lk. 2,49)?, The Irish Theological Quarterly 17 (1922) 248-263, who examines especially the old translations and the interpretations of the Fathers, without reaching, however, any definite conclusion.

[2]) The christological import of ii 49 is denied by P. Winter, *Lc.* 2,49 *and Targum Yerushalmi*, *ZNW* 45 (1954) 145-179; cf. also *ZNW* 46 (1955) 140. His argumentation does not seem to be convincing. Cf. the criticism of R. Laurentin, *op. cit.*, 143-146.

[3]) Cf. p. 169 n. 2.

[4]) *'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten, Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbstbezeichnung Jesu?*, Part III Chapter 4 (to appear shortly).

THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE AND ZECHARIAH
xiv 21

BY

CECIL ROTH
Oxford

It is obvious that a strong and persistent influence of the eschatological prophecies of Zechariah is to be traced in the New Testament. In particular, the chapters ix to xiv of this work are used almost in a systematic fashion in the Gospel story as recounted by Luke, reaching a climax in the narrative of the events leading up to the Passion. The most striking and obvious instance is the account of the deliberate fulfilment by Jesus of Zechariah ix 9 by entering Jerusalem mounted on a colt (Luke xix 29-40; Mark xi 1-10; Matthew xxi 1-9), but there are numerous other echoes in the narration and the exposition at this point [1]).

Immediately after the story of the Entry into Jerusalem in strict and literal accordance with the prophecy of Zechariah, there is another episode which seems to reflect in a remarkable fashion the same influence.

In the circumstances and general atmosphere that prevailed in Judaea at this time, it would have been certainly natural to endeavour to hasten the Messianic Deliverance by establishing—even artificially, or if necessary by force—the precise conditions in which according to Prophecy the Deliverance was to be achieved. The instance cited above is a case in point: [2]) but the sequel follows the same pattern, no less obviously. The remarkable picture of the Day of the Lord and the final triumph of the Godly over the powers of evil, which concludes the Book of Zechariah, ends

---

[1]) See F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative*, in *John Rylands Library Bulletin*, xliii, (1961); and C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, pp. 64-7.

[2]) A late analogy may be noted. A Rabbinic legend tells how the Messiah is to be found among the maimed and crippled at the gate of Rome: the sixteenth-century Jewish mystic Solomon Molcho therefore went to Rome and sat among the maimed and crippled at the city gate in order to establish the necessary condition for his messianic dream.

xiv 21*b*) with the emphatic phrase, which assumed even greater significance by its quasi-isolation: 'In that day there shall be no more a trafficker (lit. 'Canaanite') in the House of the Lord of Hosts'. The obvious corollary was, that in order to create the circumstances in which according to the Prophet the Messianic deliverance of 'that day' was to take place, it was necessary (apart from other matters) to cleanse the House of the Lord of Hosts of traffickers. Hence immediately after he came to Jerusalem, riding on a colt in accordance with the prophecy of Zechariah ix 9, Jesus entered into the Temple of God and cast out all them that sold and bought in the Temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers and the seats of them that sold the doves' (Matthew xxi 12; cf. Mark xi 15-16, Luke xix 45-6, John ii 13-7), in accordance with the prophecy of Zechariah xiv 21. It has long since been observed that the victims of this action were in some cases at least performing an organisationally useful and hardly sacrilegious function, comparable to that of candle-sellers on the steps of Catholic churches, whose activities can hardly be described as vicious even by the most determined opponents of the system. Nevertheless, in the terms of the prophecy it was necessary for these stall-holders to be ejected, for only thus would the assured conditions of the Deliverance be fully implemented.

If this interpretation is correct, obviously the Cleansing of the Temple has to be considered like so much else in the story of the ministry of Jesus in the context of Jewish nationalist sentiment of the time and his reinterpretation of it in a spiritual and basically non-political sense.

This would in fact have been the first public assertion of his Messianic claims in positive action, and for that reason would presumably have commanded eager approval from certain patriotic elements. And indeed the obviously wide-spread popular approval of the purge, sweeping before it as it seems the constituted Temple authorities, suggests that it appealed not merely to the spiritually-minded minority who might have objected to the abuse, but also to the nationalistically-inclined masses. In these circumstances, leadership in this episode could have been used reasonably enough as evidence against the instigator in support of a charge not merely of riot but of treason, as one who was engaged in conspiracy against the Roman rule. It is perhaps significant that immediately after this Jesus was put to the test by the embarrassing enquiry regarding

the tribute-money, intended to make him declare his political faith or else to forfeit the popular sympathy which he had achieved by his daring action in the Sanctuary. Incidentally, if this was a Messianic gesture, it would have its logical place at this stage of Jesus's ministry—not at its outset as is implied in John ii 13-7; nor would there be much validity in the hypothesis of the repetition now of what he had already once carried out some while before.

Meanwhile, Jesus had explained his action in 'cleansing' the Temple, but in terms which are seemingly irrelevant: 'And he taught and said unto them, Is it not written [Isaiah lvi 7] My House shall be called a House of Prayer for all the nations? but ye have made it into a den of robbers'. (Mark xi 17: from the wording it is apparent, more than in the parallel and probably derivative passage of Matthew xxi 13, that this rebuke was addressed to those who had followed him, or to the people at large, not to the traffickers who had been expelled from the sacred precinct. 'And the chief priests and scribes heard it' immediately after presumably implies that they had heard what he had done, not what he had said: but in any case they would have heard or learned of his address to the crowd.) A religious building in which stalls for facilitating the cultus have been set up, even sacrilegiously, does not become thereby a den of robbers, nor by this fact does it cease to be a house of prayer for all nations: on the contrary, the money-changers actually provided certain material facilities for those coming from abroad. Jesus seems here rather to be turning in reproof to his supporters, after realising the spirit in which his action had been misinterpreted. The Sanctuary had been cleansed of traffickers, thus helping to create the purified conditions in which Redemption would be possible. But not the nationalistic redemption anticipated by those (or some of those) who had followed him into the Temple, and now perhaps temporarily established their control there: these enthusiasts desired to make it into a focus of nationalism, a lair of 'brigands' (σπήλαιον λῃστῶν)—the term consistently applied by Josephus to the patriotic extremists who opposed the Roman rule by force of arms [1]). This was not his intention: he desired it to become a house of prayer for all, as not only Isaiah

[1]) For this interpretation of the term λῃσταί see G. W. Buchanan, *Brigands in the Temple* in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xxx, (1959) pp. 169-177, with amplification ibid., xxxi, (1960) pp. 103-105: and my article, *The Zealots in the War of* 66-70 in *Journal of Semitic Studies*, iv, (1939) pp. 332-355.

1 the passage which he quoted, but Zechariah as well in his Messianic picture, had foretold that it would be in the End of Days.

In this address, Jesus of course deliberately echoed Jeremiah, ii 11: 'Is this House which is called by My name become a den of obbers in your eyes?': the phrase 'den of robbers' (Hebrew מערת פריצי) being similarly rendered in the Septuagint σπήλαιον ῃστῶν. The relevance for the present argument is emphasized by his fact, for the Hebrew term פריצים used here (or the Aramaic quivalent פריצי—presumably the form actually uttered by Jesus) mplies especially in Rabbinic use not 'robbers' but 'the bold' or 'unruly') ones: the sense is perhaps best conveyed in English)y the term 'outlaws' or 'guerrillas'. 'The Temple should be a House of Prayer for all peoples, but you have now made it into . guerrilla fastness', is what he seems to say [1]).

In the account of the episode in Mark there is what appears to)e an inconsequential interpolation (xi 16): —'And he would not .uffer that any man should carry a vessel (σκεῦος) through the Temple'. A desecration of the Sanctuary though this might be, it s not in the same category as buying and selling, and could be considered even less to convert it into a den of robbers. Moreover, he prohibition was unnecessary, for the accepted discipline was even more severe on this point, forbidding those who entered the Temple area to carry so much as a staff or wallet, or to use it as ı 'compendaria' (sc. *via*) or short cut even when unladen (Mishnah, *Berakhoth* ix 5). Nor is the action here ascribed to Jesus compatible with his normal attitude, for a worker or porter would have been)revented now from taking his burden into the Temple courtyard ınd resting it while he offered a prayer. However, the passage at he end of the Book of Zechariah, leading up to the verse we have)een considering, places the episode in a somewhat different light: In that day . . . every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be ıoly to the Lord of Hosts: and all that sacrifice shall come and take of them and seethe therein'. In Messianic times, then, the)rdinary domestic utensils in Jerusalem were to be assimilated to the holy vessels, and the faithful could take possession of them ınd use them in preparing the sacrificial meals. In confirmation)f this, Mark seems to imply, it was ordered, after the Cleansing

[1]) It is curious that also in Josippon, the medieval Hebrew rifacimento)f Josephus, the latter's λῃσταί is consistently rendered by פריצים as in Isaiah.

of the Temple, that all utensils brought casually into the Temple area should be designated for use in the cultus, as a further token that Messianic times had begun: hence any vessel brought in was not allowed to be taken out again, as the verse states. The fact that Mark seems to go out of his way to add this point, not mentioned by the other evangelists, confirms the impression that this was for him part of the ideal Messianic picture [1]).

We must revert to the striking half-verse which closes the Book of Zechariah: 'In that day there shall be no more a trafficker in the House of the Lord of Hosts'. The word for 'trafficker' here (as in Proverbs xxxi 24: cf. also Isaiah xxiii 8 and Hosea xii 8) is as we have seen כנעני or Canaanite—an interesting sidelight perhaps on social and economic conditions in Palestine at the time when these passages were written. In patriotic circles in the first century, the term was as it seems interpreted literally, by some persons at all events. Indeed, this verse may have been used to justify the exclusion of Gentiles from the inner Temple court under pain of death—a prohibition of which we know not only from Josephus (*Wars*, v 194, vi 124-6: cf. *Antiquities* xv 417) but also from the actual warning inscription which has been discovered in two copies (one fragmentary) in the course of excavations in Jerusalem. Some persons doubtless went further, and demanded that Gentiles should be excluded entirely from all parts of the Temple, even the outer court, the so-called Court of the Gentiles: a sentiment which links up with the prevailing attitude at the time of the Revolt against Rome in 66, which was sparked off by the refusal to accept sacrifices any longer even on behalf of the Emperor or other non-Jews [2]).

Positive evidence for the prevalence of such an attitude at this time has recently come to light. In a fragment of a scroll of eschato-

---

[1]) The operative word σκεῦος, while it can mean no more than 'object' is also used to denote a receptacle or dish and even specifically (e.g. Philo, *De Vita Mosis* ii. 94: Josephus, *B.J.* vi. 389) the Temple vessels: cf. ARNDT and GINGRICH, *A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament*, s.v. The Vulgate equivalent, *uas*, respresenting ancient tradition, approximated more precisely to the implication in Zechariah.

In view of MASON's hypothesis that the Cleansing of the Temple took place on Tabernacles, it is perhaps germaine to point out that Zechariah's prophecy is specifically associated with this feast.

[2]) See my article, *The Debate on the Loyal Sacrifice, AD* 66, in *Harvard Theological Review*, liii, (1960) pp. 93-7.

gical expositions found among the so-called Dead Sea Scrolls ne following passage occurs [1]):

'The Sanctuary, O Lord, which Thy hands shall establish. The Lord shall ign for ever and ever'. [Exodus xv 17-18]. That is the House whither shall ever more enter . . . and Ammonite and Moabite and bastard and stranger's n and sojourner for ever, but only those Holy of name (?). 'The Lord shall ign for ever'—he will be seen continuously thereon, and strangers will ot make it desolate again, as they formerly made desolate the Sanctuary Israel because of their sin'.

Notwithstanding some minor difficulties in reconstructing the recise text, the meaning is clear enough. The Temple had been esecrated by permitting the entry of Gentiles—even it seems everent Gentiles such as the sojourner-proselyte (גר)—and therefore ad deserved destruction. (The specific and detailed mention of mmonites and Moabites etc., and especially of aliens and sojourners, makes it certain that the reference is not as might be imagined t first glance to the desecration of the Temple by alien invaders uch as Pompey). But the new Temple, to be built in Messianic imes by God himself ('The sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hands hall establish') would be assured of permanence, for no Gentile vould be admitted within its holy precinct. The mutilated state of the fragment makes it difficult to reconstruct precisely the exegetical argument, but the deduction seems to have been based n a bold reinterpretation of the closing verses of the Song of the Red Sea (Exodus xv 15 ff.): amazement and trembling would eize on the leaders of the Edomites and Moabites, so that they vould not venture to approach the Holy Mountain again, and the nhabitants of Canaan would melt away, the Hebrews being meanwhile reestablished and an exclusive sanctuary built by the hands of God himself, to endure in perpetuity.

It is to be noted that this text does not merely express opposition to the admission of Gentiles to the Temple, but links it up specifically with Messianic times, and apparently justifies it by reference to a passage referring to the discomfiture of the Canaanites. This as we have seen is the term used in the eschatological prophecy of Zechariah xiv 21b, which is generally rendered 'trafficker' or merchant. Rabbinic tradition to be sure consistently supported

[1]) Published by J. M. Allegro, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxxvii, 350-4. A. M. Haberman's readings in his 1959 edition of the Dead See texts are slihgtly different. The sentiments certainly accord strikingly with the hypothesis that the Dead Sea sect were Zealots rather than Essenes.

the more broad-minded interpretation: that is the rendering in the Targum (תגרא = itinerant trader) and Aquila, who was followed by Jerome ('mercator') [1]; while the Talmud (b. Pesaḥim 50a) indignantly repudiates the other and more literal rendering, with the aid of the most tortuous reasoning. On the other hand, the older Septuagint, reflecting probably prevailing opinion at the close of the Second Temple period with which we are dealing, retains at this point the literal translation or rather equivalent 'Canaanite'; and from the gloss of the Spanish exegete Abraham ibn Ezra it is apparent that even in the twelfth century there were some scholars who to his indignation perpetuated the literal and narrowly nationalistic interpretation.

We thus see that about the time of the Ministry of Jesus there were current two alternative interpretations of the prophecy in question, both reasonable enough: that in Messianic days no trafficker would be seen in the Temple; or, that no 'Canaanite' or alien would be admitted to it. Jesus, in accordance with the general tendency of Jewish opinion after his day, followed the former interpretation when he cleansed the Temple. But for those who sought out isolated phrases to support their attitude, the same passage provided Scriptural justification for the imposition of a ban on the entry of non-Jews into the Temple. It may well be that the verse figured in the missing part of the Qumran document that we have been considering; it would indeed have been more curious in the circumstances if use had not been made of it to support the policy of exclusion.

Certainly, then, in the period with which we are dealing there were some nationalistically-inclined Jews who as a point of religious and not only political principle desired the complete exclusion of Gentiles from the Temple, and considered that this would be a feature—and was hence a prerequisite—of Messianic times. For this view, they found Biblical authority as we have seen in one of the alternative explanations of the same striking half-verse at the end of the Book of Zechariah which ostensibly justified or even prescribed the Cleansing of the Temple: 'In that day there shall be no more a Canaanite in the House of the Lord of Hosts'. Jesus however, in accordance with the main stream of Jewish tradition

[1]) Cf. Jerome's gloss in *Patrologia Latina* xxv, 1540/1 where he too notes the relevance to the Cleansing of the Temple, but points out that the literal significance is different. Cf. also R. H. Lightfoot's commentary.

fter his day, interpreted the term 'Canaanite' as 'merchant', this eing made necessary indeed by his universalistic outlook; and this as the scriptural justification for the drastic action with which e began his Messianic mission.

In the light of this, his subsequent allocution may perhaps be nterpreted in a fashion somewhat different from that proposed bove. Having carried out his intention and created the necessary re-Messianic condition by expelling the traders from the Temple recinct, he assembled the people and explained his action to hem. The Temple was to be a House of Prayer for all nations and ccessible to all men, he said: and its sanctity must be preserved y the exclusion from it of mercantile operations of any sort. hey, by misinterpreting the term 'Canaanite' in a literal sense and sing it as a pretext for excluding Gentiles—whether from the nner courts only or from the entire precinct—had converted the Holy Place instead into a σπήλαιον λῃστῶν—a den of nationalist ebels.

CHRISTIAN INFLUENCE IN THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

BY

M. DE JONGE

1. *Introduction*

During the last few years it has become increasingly clear that the problem of the composition and the origin of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs cannot be profitably discussed without taking the Dead Sea Scrolls into account. In his book *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, a study of their text, composition and origin* [1]) (the manuscript of which was finished in September 1952) the present author paid only little attention to the parallels between the Testaments and the writings discovered at Qumran, but since then publications like those by A. DUPONT-SOMMER [2]) and B. OTZEN [3]), and especially the discovery of new fragments of an Aramaic Testament of Levi and a Hebrew Testament of Naphtali [4]) have made it abundantly clear that the Testaments have to be studied alongside the Scrolls of Qumran, and that in the course of this study the problem of the relationship between the Jewish and the Christian elements in the Testaments will have to be examined afresh.

In a paper presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957 entitled *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament* [5]) the present author tried to sum up the position at that moment with

---

[1]) Assen 1953, quoted below as *The Testaments*.

[2]) E.g. his "Le Testament de Lévi (xvii-xviii) et la secte juive de l'Alliance", *Semitica* IV, 1952, pp. 33-53, compare *Nouveaux Aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, Paris 1953, pp. 63-84. See also his recent book *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte*. Paris 1959, pp. 313-319, 364-366.

[3]) "Die neugefundenen hebräischen Sektenschriften und die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen", *Studia Theologica* VII, 1954, pp. 124-157.

[4]) See D. BARTHÉLEMY and J. T. MILIK, *Qumran Cave* I, Oxford 1955, pp. 87-91 and J. T. MILIK, *Revue Biblique* LXII, 1955, pp. 398-406; LXIII, 1956, p. 407 n. 1.

[5]) Published in *Studia Evangelica* (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Band* 73). Berlin 1959, pp. 546-556.

regard to the problem of the relationship between the Testaments and the New Testament. Some two months later A. S. VAN DER WOUDE published his important book *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* [1]) in which he devotes his second chapter to "Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen" (pp. 190-216), discussing the parallels between the writings of Qumran and the Testaments with regard to the messianic expectations. M. PHILONENKO's study *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qumran* [2]) is a monograph devoted entirely to the discussion of the problems which concern us in this article. This scholar follows A. DUPONT-SOMMER in assuming a very close link between the Testaments and the writings of Qumran and in reducing the Christian influence to an almost negligible minimum.

The aim of the present article is to make a contribution to the discussion of the problem of the Christian influence in the Testaments by a careful examination of the views put forward by VAN DER WOUDE and PHILONENKO [3]). The present author is well aware of the difficulties which the student of this subject meets on his path. Only part of the Qumran material has so far been published and for this reason his conclusions can only be provisional. Moreover scholars tend to differ widely in their treatment of a number of important problems concerning the origin of the Qumran documents and in their exegesis of certain passages of crucial importance. The present author is not a Qumran specialist and does not regard himself as qualified to express an independent opinion on the many problems connected with the sect of Qumran and its writings. In the examination of the views under discussion all emphasis will be laid upon their treatment of the various passages of the Testaments individually and upon the opinions concerning the origin and the background of the Testaments as a whole.

---

[1]) Assen 1957.

[2]) *Cahiers de la Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses no* 35, Paris 1960, published before in *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*, 1958, pp. 309-343; 1959, pp. 14-38. In the present study the 1960-edition has been used.

[3]) Important also is the IVth part of Max-Alain CHEVALLIER's book *L'esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament*, Paris 1958, entitled "L'Esprit et le Messie dans les Testaments des Douze Patriarches et dans les écrits de Qumran", pp. 111-144.

2. *A. S. van der Woude's theory*

The views put forward by A. S. VAN DER WOUDE may be summarized as follows [1]). The Testaments were originally a Jewish document, but it is impossible to reconstruct the Jewish "Grundschrift" by removing a number of Christian interpolations, because the Testaments have not only been interpolated but also rewritten and abbreviated. The fragments of an Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Cairo Genizah, which were published in Appendix III of R. H. CHARLES's edition of the Testaments [2]) together with a Greek fragment which is incorporated in a tenth century manuscript from Mount Athos, and the fragments published and announced by J. T. MILIK which are in close agreement with these show clearly that the present Greek text of Test. Levi is a very much abbreviated and completely rewritten form of the Aramaic or Hebrew "Vorlage". Still, much original material has been preserved in this way. Unfortunately, he thinks, we are not in a position to to decide whether the original was rewritten before the Christian passages were added or whether the person(s) responsible for the Christian additions were also responsible for the editing of the original material, but VAN DER WOUDE considers the first possibility the more likely one: "Ob der Text schon gekürzt und umgearbeitet wurde, bevor die christlichen Interpolationen in den Text hineingerieten, ist nicht zu entscheiden, auf Grund der weniger interpolierten armenischen Übersetzung jedoch nicht unwahrscheinlich" [3]).

VAN DER WOUDE agrees with the present author in that he does not accept the interpolation-theory advocated until recently by nearly all scholars in the field. He does not follow him, however, in assuming that the Testaments are a Christian document written by a Christian author who used much Jewish material in composing it. His arguments against Christian authorship are: 1) The many Hebraisms (or Aramaisms) in the Greek text of the Testaments (see the list in R. H. CHARLES, *The Greek Versions* etc., pp. XXIII ff.) point to an original Jewish document. 2) In the passages in which Levi and Judah are mentioned side by side we should not speak of a "common pattern" (as the present author did) but of a "fest-

[1]) See especially *op. cit.*, pp. 191-194; pp. 214-216.
[2]) *The Greek versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford 1908.
[3]) *Op. cit.*, p. 193.

eprägter Text". 3) In several places the Armenian version has iffered less from Christian interpolations than the Greek [1]). Several passages which were considered Christian by the present uthor need not be Christian at all. In his review of VAN DER VOUDE's book in the *Vox Theologica* [2]) J. VAN DER PLOEG remarks hat there is not so much difference between VAN DER WOUDE's heory and the present author's conclusions as the former tends o think. Moreover, he says, between these two points of view there s a whole range of possible positions which differ slightly from ach other as well as from the two extremes. The present author s inclined to agree with Professor VAN DER PLOEG's views because urther study of the Testaments made him change his mind on everal points. In 1957 he wrote in his *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament*: "It must be admitted that the picture given in the present writer's book of a Christian author ollecting Jewish material and using it for the composition of his book makes too little allowance for the part played by oral tradition n Judaism and Christianity of the first two centuries A.D. It is quite conceivable that the Christian author(s) was (were) only the ast of a series of collectors and redactors of Testament material vhich was transmitted in writing as well as orally, gradually grew n size during the ages and was adapted to various needs" [3]). In his paper I also admitted that in particular the apocalyptical passages of the Testaments (the ones which VAN DER WOUDE liscusses) present difficulties to the "composition-theory". The act that the passages which show a common pattern ("Sin-Exile-Return" and "Levi-Judah") have been used and adapted to Christian needs in a variety of ways, and the fact that some of these passages do not show any trace of Christian alteration at all are strong indications that there was at least one Jewish stage in the composition of these passages and probably also of the whole work. This does not mean, however, that we can return to the earlier interpolation-theory with regard to the apocalyptical passages. The way in which the material found in the fragments of the Aramaic Testament of Levi has been used in the composition of the Testament of Levi incorporated in the Testaments, makes

---

[1]) VAN DER WOUDE thinks he has proved this in at least one case, viz. T. Jud. XXIV (to be discussed below).
[2]) XXIX, 1958, pp. 56-58.
[3]) *Op. cit.*, p. 550.

it abundantly clear that this theory must be dismissed altogether. Also in the apocalyptical passages we cannot expect to find the Messianic ideas of the Jewish author(s) by removing a number of Christian expressions.

So much for VAN DER WOUDE's second point; now we turn to his first one. The problem of the Hebraisms (and/or Aramaisms) in the Testaments was discussed by the present author on p. 16[illegible] of *The Testaments*—a passage not referred to by VAN DER WOUDE. It may be pointed out that not all passages which seem to betray a Semitic original have to be translations of such an original [1]) an author who knew the Septuagint can well have composed these passages in a sort of "Septuagint Greek". Secondly the list of Hebraisms drawn up by R. H. CHARLES requires careful sifting; especially fanciful are some of his attempts to find the original meaning of a passage through retranslation into Hebrew or through assuming a confusion between two Hebrew words. Thirdly a number of passages definitely goes back to the LXX (very probably the main theme of T. Issachar was taken from that source! [2]). Fourthly, if there are cases in which we can or must think of a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic (and there are such!) we should bear in mind that this only shows that this particular passage was taken from a Hebrew or Aramaic source—and not even necessarily directly.

As to VAN DER WOUDE's contention that the Armenian translation has fewer Christian interpolations than the Greek text (I should like to refer to Chapter I § 3 of *The Testaments* [3]) where after an analysis of the Armenian version in T. Levi and some other parts of the Testaments I came to the conclusions "that the value of the Armenian version for the reconstruction of the original Greek text has been greatly overrated. Its readings seldom inspire confidence and its omissions disfigure the text in many places" and "that A is of little value for the discovery and removal of Christian additions to the Greek text". VAN DER WOUDE bases his conclusions on the study of only a few passages (which we shall discuss later on) and not on an examination of the whole text or, at least, of a con-

---

[1]) See e.g. the example mentioned in n. 2 on p. 210.
[2]) See *The Testaments* pp. 117 f.; p. 163 n. 5 and p. 195 n. 1 below.
[3]) Pp. 23-34; quotations from p. 30 and p. 34.

iderable portion of it, so that his theory does not seem to be based on sufficient evidence [1]).

VAN DER WOUDE's fourth point makes it necessary for us to discuss the question of method. If we assume (as VAN DER WOUDE and the present author do) that the Testaments in their present form have been used and edited by Christians in one way or another, we must always reckon with the possibility that those passages too which are not evidently Christian do not come from a Jewish hand. VAN DER WOUDE's method of approach resembles to some extent that of CHARLES, BOUSSET and others who removed the more prominent Christian interpolations and presented the remaining, not so obviously Christian parts, as products of a Jewish preformation of Christianity. In the interpretation of a writing with such a complicated history as the Testaments many conclusions will necessarily remain hypothetical, but it seems right to assume that a particular passage is Christian until clear evidence of the contrary is adduced. In other words: The burden of proof does not fall on him who assumes that a certain passage is Christian, but on the scholar who considers a passage Jewish or, more especially, Essene. I should like to repeat here what I wrote in 1957: "The parallels in the Qumran documents are no doubt of great importance for the discovery of pre-Christian elements in the Testaments as well as for the illustration of their general background, but it is far more difficult to use material from the Testaments for the reconstruction of the views of the Qumran sect. At the most the Testaments may, sometimes, give corroborating evidence, viz. in those cases where conceptions found in them agree with those which may definitely be attributed to the members of the Qumran sect. And even then the literary and historical relationship cannot be defined exactly" [2]). This complicated problem cannot, however,

---

[1]) It should be borne in mind that both Sargis JOVSĒPHEANÇ in his edition of the Armenian version of the Testaments (Venice 1896) and R. H. CHARLES in his apparatus could only use part of the available MSS. Dr. W. C. H. DRIESSEN kindly told me that, according to information received by him, not less than 21 MSS of the Armenian version are kept in the State Library in Erevan in Armenia (CHARLES could only use 1 MS from Armenia, besides 11 from Western Europe). This new material will have to be studied carefully before we can draw definite conclusions with regard to the relationship between the Greek manuscripts and the Armenian version.

[2]) *Op. cit.* p. 555. Originally Essene passages may also have been taken over by a Christian redactor without alteration, because he agreed with

be solved by methodological considerations alone. In each individual case a careful analysis will have to show whether a passage is more likely to be Christian or Jewish. The greater part of this article will be devoted to an examination of a number of disputed passages.

3. *M. Philonenko's theory*

PHILONENKO goes much further than VAN DER WOUDE. He states that "la parenté entre les *Testaments* et les textes du désert de Juda est, en effet, d'une aveugle évidence" and from this he at once concludes to a "commune origine" [1]). Like VAN DER WOUDE and the present author he assumes that a Hebrew Testament of Levi formed the starting-point for the present collection of Testaments [2]) and that the Aramaic and Greek fragments published by CHARLES and MILIK give us an idea as to the nature and contents of that document. Later on a Testament of Judah and a Testament of Naphtali were composed after this model [3]). These three Testaments were, at a still later stage, abbreviated by a redactor, who omitted many ritual prescriptions and much haggadic material, but added a number of exhortations. This redactor was, according to PHILONENKO, an Essene. The other Testaments were grouped around the three so redacted. "Au terme de cette étape se trouvait constituée une collection de douze Testaments, où de pieuses et pressantes exhortations étaient illustrées par des légendes sur les patriarches". Like F. SCHNAPP [4]) (followed later by CHARLES and BOUSSET) who discovered the hand of a Jewish interpolator in the Testaments, PHILONENKO thinks that a number of important passages were added to the Testaments by yet another Essene, who in the case of T. Benjamin did his job so thoroughly that we should not speak of interpolation but of redaction. This man was responsible for the "Sin-Exile-Return"-passages which, according to PHILONENKO, show a number of interesting parallels with the Psalms of Solomon and must, therefore, like these Psalms, be dated in

---

what he found before him. In such cases the interpreter will have to bear in mind: si duo dicunt idem, non est idem.

[1]) *Op. cit.* p. 3.

[2]) For this and the following see *op. cit.* pp. 4-7.

[3]) With regard to T. Naphtali this hypothesis is a very probable one—see also my *The Testaments*, pp. 52-60. As to T. Judah I should prefer more cautious conclusions (*Ibid.*, pp. 60-71). PHILONENKO does not adduce any proof for these assertions.

[4]) In his *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen untersucht*, Halle 1884.

ne period shortly after 63 B.C.[1]). He also wrote the "Levi-Judah"-assages, passages which deal with the resurrection and a number f universalistic statements. "Il est absolument remarquable que outes les "interpolations christologiques" appartiennent à la trate que nous venons de situer. C'est là un argument très fort en aveur de l'authenticité de ces textes. Un interpolateur chrétien ût retouché l'ouvrage dans son entier". There are no Christian nterpolations at all; the passages which have always been called Christian are in reality the work of the Essene interpolator just nentioned. "Ce n'est point dire cependant, soulignons-le, que la christologie des *Testaments* soit identique aux doctrines messianiques des manuscrits du désert de Juda. Sur bien des points, au contraire, les *Testaments* en majorent et précisent la portée". It should also be borne in mind, PHILONENKO thinks, that any argumentation in these matters is bound to be "caténaire"; in our analysis of the relevant passages we should start with those who present fewest difficulties in order to be able to interpret the more complicated texts with the help of those studied first.

Some critical remarks with regard to PHILONENKO's method would seem to be appropriate. Firstly it seems to be too rash to assume a common origin on the basis of similarity of ideas[2]). Secondly it is to be regretted that PHILONENKO does not examine the relation between the passages which he regards as interpolated and their context in each individual case. His sketch of the history of the origins of the Testaments is too summary to be convincing; moreover he fails to provide clear evidence on many important points. Thirdly: in other passages than those mentioned by PHILONENKO Christian influence also may be recognised—as I hope to demonstrate in a moment. Fourthly: Even PHILONENKO makes the remark that the Christology of the Testaments is not identical with the Messianic ideas of the people of the Dead Sea Scrolls (as

---

[1]) He mentions especially T.Zeb. IX, 5 (discussed below, pp. 229 f.) which, according to him, contains "une claire allusion" to the conflict between Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II, and T.Jud. xxii, 2 which gives "une allusion non moins claire . . . à l'accession au trône d'Hérode le Grand". These allusions are not clear enough to be convincing. At the most they could give corroborating evidence after it had been proved in another way that these passages of the Testaments were written at that time. The parallels between the S.E.R.-passages and the Psalms of Solomon are of such a general nature that they cannot supply this proof.

[2]) See "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the N.T.", pp. 554 f.

far as we know these at present). Of course the possibility of development may not be ruled out; it is even likely that the Messianic ideas of the Qumran sect underwent a gradual change in the course of time, or that there were differences of opinion on this point between various groups within the Essene movement. It is also possible that in the course of this development terms and expressions were used which resemble those which became the usual ones in the Christian Church. The question must be asked, however, how we are to prove that such a development did indeed take place in the sect of Qumran if the only available evidence comes from the Testaments which, if they have not been rewritten by a Christian, were in any case read, copied and commented upon in the Christian Church, which handed them down to us. We cannot regard a number of passages in the Testaments which (to put it mildly) sound Christian as evidence for changed Essene beliefs on the basis of a supposed development within the Essene movement for which we find no proof outside the Testaments. When PHILONENKO tells us: "Si notre démonstration est recevable c'est toute l'histoire des doctrines messianiques au temps de Jésus qui se trouve placée dans une lumière nouvelle" [1]) and when he uses as motto for his study LOHMEYER's word: "Wie dem auch sein mag, der Schluss wird notwendig, dass schon im Judentum das Bild einer göttlichen Gestalt in niedriger Menschlichkeit oder eines Menschen in göttlicher Würde vorhanden war. Und in der Tat scheinen auch die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen eine ähnliche Anschauung zu kennen", the question has to be asked whether those far-reaching conclusions are not the result of reasoning in a circle.

The problems under discussion do not only affect the origin and the background of the Testaments and their connection with the Dead Sea Scrolls. If PHILONENKO is right, we shall have to revise our theories concerning the Messianic ideas among the Jews in the period immediately before and after the beginning of our era and, in addition, our views concerning the origins of early Christian Christology. Again, however, it should be said that the problems which concern us here cannot be solved by methodological considerations only. It will be necessary to examine the passages mentioned by PHILONENKO just as carefully as those used by VAN DER WOUDE. To this examination we now proceed.

[1]) *Op. cit.*, p. 60.

4. *Some passages concerning Joseph*

We have just seen that PHILONENKO regards his argumentation s "caténaire". Every scholar who has ever occupied himself with ıe Testaments will agree with him that it is impossible to argue ifferently. It seems to me, however, that PHILONENKO gives a rong interpretation of those links in our chain which are among ur strongest, viz. the passages dealing with Joseph, which he ıentions last of all, but which should, I think, be discussed first.

In his XIVth chapter [1]) PHILONENKO calls Joseph the central igure in the Testaments—and rightly so. Joseph is the person who ossesses all virtues, but who suffers from the hatred and the envy f his brothers. Hippolytus of Rome regards him, like many cclesiastical authors after him, as a type of Christ [2]). With regard o some passages of the Testaments, e.g. T.B. III, 8 we might be empted to think that the final redactor of the Testaments takes he same view but from other texts it becomes clear that the Joseph of the Testaments is "le 'type' du Serviteur souffrant, du Juste par excellence, entendons du Maître de Justice" [3]). PHILONENKO criticizes the present author because he assumed the Christian origin of this typology and failed to note that this is already found in Jewish, especially Alexandrian Jewish sources. As an example PHILONENKO mentions Wisd. X, 13-14.

I do not think PHILONENKO has succeeded in proving his case. It need not surprise us that certain Christian notions agree or are closely connected with Jewish ideas, e.g. with those found in Wisdom-literature. In the case of the picture of the ideal Joseph this can be demonstrated at several points. Whether the picture of Joseph which emerges from the Testaments is of Christian origin —and this is not just a matter of stray remarks in individual Testaments but of a picture which is typical of the whole document —can only be decided with the help of a few clear passages. If it can be demonstrated that those are Christian we may assume that

---

[1]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 50-58.

[2]) See *The Testaments*, p. 123, L. MARIÈS, "Le Messie issu de Lévi chez Hippolyte de Rome", *Mélanges J. Lebreton, Recherches de Science Religieuse* XXXIX, 1951, pp. 381-396 and A. W. ARGYLE, "Joseph the Patriarch in Patristic Teaching", *Expository Times* LXVII, 1956, pp. 199-201. Like MARIÈS, PHILONENKO assumes that Hippolytus knew and used the Testaments. I do not think, however, that there is enough evidence to prove—or to disprove—this contention.

[3]) *Op. cit.*, p. 50.

the other passages also have gone through the hands of a Christian redactor and that the Testaments are Christian, at any rate in their present form.

It is indeed possible, I think, to prove that some passages dealing with Joseph can only be Christian in their present form. These passages do not belong to the interpolations mentioned by PHILONENKO, but belong to the exhortatory parts of the Testaments. Let us consider PHILONENKO's first passage in his chapter on Joseph, T. Zeb, III, 2-3: ἀλλὰ Συμέων καὶ Γὰδ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἓξ ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν λαβόντες τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, ἐπρίασαντο ὑποδήματα ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ταῖς γυναιξὶν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν, εἰπόντες· οὐ φαγόμεθα αὐτήν, ὅτι τιμὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἡμῶν αὕτη, ἀλλὰ καταπατήσει καταπατήσωμεν αὐτήν,ἀνθ' ὧν εἶπε βασιλεύειν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς . . .

PHILONENKO rightly mentions as parallels Amos ii 6 and Wisd. X, 13-14, and he assumes that the author of the Testaments applied the Amos-text to Joseph because he regarded him as one who was perfect and righteous, a type of the Teacher of Righteousness. The brothers in T.Zeb. III, 2-3 speak, however, also of a τιμὴ αἵματος and this expression recalls Matt. xxvii 6, a text which PHILONENKO does not mention [1]). The question has to be answered: Was Matthew influenced by the Testaments or did the author(s) of the Testaments know Matthew? "Price of blood" presupposes violent death, and it is clear that this expression is out of place in a description of what Joseph had to suffer from his brothers. The author of the Testaments must, therefore, have modelled the type after the antitype, and it is quite likely that he had Jesus as antitype in mind. It is, of course, not impossible to suppose that already an Essene writer used the expression "price of blood" for the money which the brothers received when they sold Joseph, because the Teacher of Righteousness had met with a violent death [2]). Such a theory is, however, entirely hypothetical and, in fact, improbable. The Joseph-Christ-

---

[1]) Compare also T.Zeb. II, 2, where Joseph says to his brothers: μὴ ἐπαγάγετε ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐκχέαι αἷμα ἀθῷον, ὅτι οὐχ ἥμαρτον εἰς ὑμᾶς with Matt. xxvii 4 where Judas says: ἥμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα ἀθῷον. The parallel is striking but we can only use it as corroborative evidence, because the expression "innocent blood" occurs several times in the O.T.

[2]) Assuming that the Teacher was indeed killed by his enemies—a point which many scholars think has not yet been proved convincingly. This problem does not, however, affect our argumentation.

ypology is found frequently in the Early Church, and the supposition that the Essenes regarded Joseph as a type of the Teacher f Righteousness rests only on the evidence supplied by the 'estaments. Moreover we do not know that the Teacher before is death was betrayed or "sold"—and this is a very prominent eature in the N.T.-account of Jesus' death. Until convincing proof f the contrary can be given, we shall do wise to assume a Christian rigin for T.Zeb. III, 2-3.

Next, PHILONENKO discusses T. Jos. I, 4, 6-7 which does not help s much further. After this he quotes T. Zeb. IV, 10 according to he MSS of the α-family: τὸν γὰρ χιτῶνα ἐξέδυσαν τὸν Ιωσὴφ ἐν ᾧ πιπράσκειν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν ἱμάτιον δουλικόν. his passage, like the preceding one, calls Joseph a δοῦλος, because according to PHILONENKO) the patriarch was seen as the type of he true Servant of the Lord, the Essene Teacher. It is impossible o disprove this hypothesis. In the most reliable MS, *b*, [1]) we read nowever, that Joseph's brothers stripped off from him τὸν χιτῶνα τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν and that they put upon him a ἱμάτιον παλαιὸν δούλου. The reference to the kenosis of Christ (comp. Phil. ii 1-11) s, I think, obvious, but we cannot prove that this was really in the uthor's mind when he wrote this. In T.Zeb. IV, 4 we read that Joseph ἐποίησε δὲ ἐν τῷ λάκκῳ τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας— ι detail not mentioned in the Biblical story, where the events n Dothan all take place during one single day. PHILONENKO says: 'Voilà le trait—étranger au texte biblique—qui donne à notre écit sa portée symbolique" [2]) and we may agree with him here. He does not, however, connect this with Christ's stay of three days nd three nights in the heart of the earth, mentioned in Matt. xii 40 ut with the destiny of the Teacher of Righteousness. "La descente lu fils de Jacob dans la citerne est le "type" de la catabase du Maître de Justice dans les profondeurs de l'Abîme .... Mais 'Abîme n'avait pas retenu celui qui y était descendu. Les *Testaments* nous révèlent, précision intéressante, que Joseph, en qui nous avons reconnu à nouveau le Maître de Justice, émerge de la Fosse infernale après trois jours et trois nuits". As parallels from the Dead Sea Scrolls PHILONENKO mentions 1 QH II, 17; V, 38-39; VI, 24; VIII, 28-30, passages which speak about the distress of the Teacher (if we may identify the author of the Hymns with

[1]) See *The Testaments*, pp. 18-22.
[2]) *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

him). He also points to 1 QH III, 19-20 where the author speaks of deliverance from the pit and to T. Jos. I, 4 where Joseph says εἰς λάκκον με ἐχάλασαν καὶ ὁ ὕψιστος ἀνήγαγέ με. I leave aside the question whether 1 QH really speaks of a descent into the underworld and ascent from it (it seems to me that the texts just mentioned have to be interpreted metaphorically like similar passages in the Old Testament, comp. Is. xxxviii 17; Ps. cvii 17-22; Ps. xviii 5, 6; Ps. lxxxviii 2-10). The parallel between T.Jos. I, 4 and the passages from the Hodayot is of such a general nature that no conclusions can be drawn from it. A decisive argument against PHILONENKO's interpretation of T.Zeb. IV, 4, however, is given by the fact that the three days and three nights which are well-known in Christian tradition are nowhere found in the literature of Qumran. Again we must say: Until convincing proof of the contrary is given, we shall do wise to regard T.Zeb. IV, 4 as a Christian passage.

The same is true of T.Gad II, 3-5, a passage about which even PHILONENKO writes: "Il est évidemment difficile de ne pas penser à Mt. xxvii 3-9 et CHARLES déclare que la fin du verset 3, omise par α, est une addition chrétienne [1]). This passage reads in *b*: διὸ ἐγὼ καὶ Ἰούδας πεπράκαμεν αὐτὸν τοῖς Ἰσμαηλίταις τριάκοντα χρυσῶν καὶ τὰ δέκα ἀποκρύψαντες τὰ εἴκοσι ἐδείξαμεν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἡμῶν. καὶ οὕτως τῇ πλεονεξίᾳ ἐπληροφορήθην τῆς ἀναιρέσεως αὐτοῦ. καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων μου ἐρρύσατο αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου ἵνα ποιήσω ἀνόμημα ἐν Ἰσραήλ. Gen. xxxvii 28 mentions twenty shekels, T.Gad thirty; PHILONENKO thinks that the latter text was influenced by Zech. xi 12-13 where thirty pieces of silver are mentioned. "Nos subtils docteurs, lisant le onzième chapitre du livre de *Zacharie*, découvraient dans ce berger que Dieu avait choisi pour paître son peuple, et qui avait été rejeté, méprisé, estimé à trente sicles d'argent, la figure du Maître". In CDC XIX, 8 Zech. xi 11 is applied to the Teacher of Righteousness.

It is quite likely that there is a connection between T.Gad II 3-5 and Zech. xi 12-13; there is, however, also a close link between Zech. xi and Matthew's description of Judas's treacherous activities (Matt. xxvi 15; xxvii 3 ff.) and it is indeed, as PHILONENKO says, difficult not to think of Matt. xxvii in connection with

[1]) *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

.Gad. It is not impossible that a midrash like that found in T.Gad riginated in the Qumran sect. But it is a hazardous undertaking o oppose the interpretation of T.Gad. II, 3-5 as a Christian nidrash (which is supported by the parallels in Matthew) on the :rength of the hypothesis of an example of Essene midrashic :hinking for which no parallels can be given.

A few points require a more detailed examination. 1) T.Gad peaks of gold, whereas Gen. xxxvii 28 (Hebr.); Zech. xi 12-13 Hebr. and LXX); Matt. xxvi 15; xxvii 9 all mention pieces of ilver. Only in the LXX-version of Gen. xxxvii 28 pieces of gold re mentioned. The author of T.Gad II, 3-5 must have used the eptuagint, and only because he wished to describe Joseph as a ype of Jesus Christ did he connect the *twenty* pieces of *gold* with he *thirty* pieces of *silver* in the peculiar way found in *v.* 3 [1]). 2) PHILONENKO regards the expression τρίακοντα χρυσῶν as a ebraism; one would expect τρίακοντα χρυσία, but the expression n our text is a translation of the Hebr. שלשים זהב. It does not eem necessary, however, to go back to the Hebrew: τρίακοντα indeclin.) χρυσῶν is an ordinary genitivus pretii. 3) Though it is ikely that T.G. II, 3 was written by a Christian the same cannot e said with certainty of the context in which it stands. *V.* 4 tries o connect *v.* 3 with the context by the somewhat illogical statement hat because of covetousness Gad was bent on slaying Joseph [2]).

[1]) The relationship between the Masoretic text and the LXX presents is with a great number of difficulties. According to F. M. CROSS, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and modern biblical studies*, London 1958, op. 120-145 the fragments found in Cave IV prove that "the Septuagint eflects accurately a Hebrew textual tradition at home in Egypt in the hird-second centuries B.C." and he says that "thanks to the Qumrān manuscripts we have the means to control its evidence (quotations from op. 134-135). This problem concerns us only in so far as the fact that a Hebrew *Vorlage* of at least some passages of the LXX was known and used n Qumran could explain why various passages of the Testaments (see p. 186 n. 2) go back to a text of the Septuagintal type. It is, however, far more simple to explain these parallels between the Greek Testaments and the Greek text of the Septuagint by assuming direct quotations from the LXX; it would be very remarkable, if the translator of the Testaments and the translator(s) of the LXX had chosen exactly the same wording in a particular passage. In fact we should have to assume that the former, while translating the Testaments had the LXX-translation in mind. Moreover we should not forget that the pre-Septuagintal Hebrew Text was not by any means the only Bible text in use in Qumran. Many MSS found there are, for instance, of a proto-Masoretic type (see further Cross in the book mentioned above).

[2]) See *The Testaments*, p. 101.

In T.B. II, 3 Joseph tells his brother Benjamin that he wa flogged by the Ishmaelites. On this verse PHILONENKO remarks On remarquera que les *Testaments*, comme les évangiles synopti ques, emploient ici le verbe rare et caractéristique de φραγελλόω [1]. If the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified (as he thinks ha been demonstrated) he must have been flogged, according t Roman custom; consequently we may read in T.B. II, 3 a referenc to the Teacher. This theory does not explain, however, the strikin agreement in terminology between T.B. II, 3 and the Gospel account, so that, again, Christian influence in this verse is quit likely [2]).

At the end of his chapter on Joseph [3]) PHILONENKO discusse the differences between the Hebr. T. Naphtali which we posses in a medieval form [4]) and the Greek Testament found among th Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The Hebr. Testamen printed by CHARLES is late and secondary but it may go back to a older text. The present author has tried to prove that both th Hebrew and the Greek Testament go back to an original T Naphtali, and that the Hebrew which we have is in some place (especially in the visions recorded in Gr. T.N. V and VI) nearer t the original than the Greek [5]). PHILONENKO is of a differen

---

[1]) *Op. cit.*, p. 52.

[2]) φραγελλόω is indeed a rare and remarkable word—see W. BAUER *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, s.v. who calls it a Christian word, bu adds "doch vgl. Text. Benj. 2, 3 u. Aesop aus dem Cod. Paris 1277". Th word is a latinism (flagellare). See also A. W. ARGYLE, "The influence c the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs upon the New Testament' *Expository Times* LXIII, 1951-'52, pp. 256-258, who thinks that also her the N.T. was influenced by the Testaments.

T.B. II, 3 tells us that after the flogging Joseph was told to run: κα φραγελλώσας με εἶπε τρέχειν (so *b; c* plural). PHILONENKO mentions i comparison Ev. Petr. III, 6-7 οἱ δὲ λάβοντες τὸν Κύριον ὤθουν αὐτὸ τρέχοντες καὶ ἔλεγον . . . The parallel is not very convincing, and, moreover a command to run is just what one would expect under the circumstances

[3]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 55-58.

[4]) Text in CHARLES, *The Greek versions*, Appendix II.

[5]) See *The Testaments*, pp. 52-60. For the fragment of a Hebrew Test Naphtali found in Qumran our only information is that given by J. T. MILIK in *RB* LXIII, 1956, p. 407 n. 1. According to MILIK it is not possible t establish a connection between this fragment and the Hebrew Testamen already known. "La partie conservée relate la généalogie de Bilha dan une rédaction bien plus longue que celle du Test. XII Patr. grec, *Test. Neph* I, 6-12". Important is MILIK's remark: "Je crois pourtant maintenir qu les Testaments des Douze Patriarches n'existaient pas à l'époque pré chrétienne, en Palestine du moins".

pinion. According to him the hostile attitude towards Joseph in ıe Hebrew Testament has to be explained as a reaction from the raise which is bestowed upon Joseph in our Testaments. "Mieux ncore, c'est le Maître de justice qu'attaquent les uns et que éfendent les autres".

I shall not enter into the details of PHILONENKO's argumentation; he reader may compare the relevant passages in his book and in ıine. The principal objection against PHILONENKO's theory is hat Joseph who is praised in many passages is not glorified in he Greek Test. Naphtali. In the Greek visions he plays a mysterious ôle which can only be understood if one notices that the picture of Joseph given in the more elaborate account of the visions in Hebr. T.N. II-VI is a very unsympathetic one. The author of the Testaments wanted to remove all things which did not favour his ıero and in doing so he even sacrificed the clarity of his account. The same conclusion is reached if one compares the epilogue after he visions in Gr. T.N. VII, 1-3 with Hebr. T.N. III, 13 and VII. In the Hebr. Testament Jacob condemns his favourite son and ıdmonishes his children not to follow him, but to obey Levi and Judah. In the Greek Testament Jacob tells Naphtali that he ıccepts these two visions as proof for Joseph's being alive—a general statement which is in no way connected with the characteristic features of the visions which even in their Greek form betray an antagonism between Levi and Judah on one side and Joseph on the other. On Gr. T.N. VII PHILONENKO comments: "Le Maître de justice vit mystérieusement parmi les siens" [1]), a statement which does not find any support in T.N. V-VII at all.

After the examples given above it does not seem rash to conclude that the Testaments, though perhaps not composed by a Christian author using much Jewish traditional material of all kinds (as I thought in my book), underwent at any rate a thoroughgoing Christian redaction, and that the Christian redactor(s) is (are) responsible for the picture of Joseph as a type of Jesus Christ and as an example for all believers. The contention that already in Qumran Joseph was regarded as a type of the Teacher of Righteousness seems to me to find as yet too little support in the available evidence.

Not only in the passages just mentioned, but also in some

[1]) *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

further texts which deal with Joseph Christian influence can b discerned—though we shall have to admit that strict proof canno be given so that they can only supply corroborating evidence. I T. Jos. XVII, 8 (*b*) Joseph says: καὶ οὐχ ὕψωσα ἐμαυτὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐ ἀλαζονείᾳ, διὰ τὴν κοσμικὴν δόξαν μου, ἀλλ' ἤμην ἐν αὐτοῖς ὡ εἷς τῶν ἐλαχίστων. The agreement with Mark x 42-45 and paralle passages is clear, and I think, not accidental. In T.B. III, 8 (*b* we read: πληρωθήσεται ἐν σοὶ (= Joseph) προφητεία οὐρανοῦ περ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος τοῦ κόσμου, ὅτι ἄμωμος ὑπὲ ἀνόμων παραδοθήσεται καὶ ἀναμάρτητος ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀποθανεῖται ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης, ἐπὶ σωτερίᾳ ἐθνῶν καὶ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ καταργήσε Βελίαρ καὶ τοὺς ὑπηρετοῦντας αὐτῷ. PHILONENKO devotes hi XIIIth chapter to this single verse [1]). He tries to find Biblica and Jewish parallels for every expression. These cannot b discussed here, but it does not seem superfluous to remark tha PHILONENKO admits that the title σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου (or a Hebrev equivalent) is not found in the literature of the Qumran sect About this title he says on p. 17: "Les auteurs des *Testaments*, e élévant le chef de la secte de l'Alliance à cette dignité hors de pai majorent et précisent sensiblement, reconnaissons-le, la porté des textes de Qumrân". Also with regard to the expression ἐπ σωτηρίᾳ ἐθνῶν καὶ Ἰσραήλ Philonenko can only mention parallel from the Testaments themselves. Commenting on T. Jos. XIX, 1 where a similar expression occurs, Philonenko remarks [2]): "Le גוים précèdent ici Israël. Le passage est d'un large universalisme" But he does not answer the question how this universalism tallie with the marked sectarian attitude found in the Qumran Scrolls [3]) Next, it is remarkable that in the two passages from Qumra mentioned by PHILONENKO to illustrate the idea of expiation, viz 1 QS IX, 3-4 and CDC XIV, 18-20 (where the verb כפר occurs we do not find that this expiation is brought about by one wh gives his life for it, and that is without doubt the central them in T.B. III, 8. Though certain expressions may be Jewish as wel as Christian, the whole passage must have been written by Christian.

Last of all I should like to mention T. Jos. VIII, 5. W. K. L

---

[1]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 47-49.
[2]) *Op. cit.*, p. 30.
[3]) See also *The Testaments*, pp. 127 f. and below, p. 207.

CLARKE [1]) and A. W. ARGYLE [2]) have indicated the parallel between Joseph in his dark prison, who praises the Lord and Paul and Silas in prison in Philippi (Acts xvi 25). CLARKE pointed out that the word ἐπακροάομαι is in the LXX and in the N.T. only found in Acts xvi 25. This parallel too would be better explained, not by dependence of the N.T. upon the Testaments, but by dependence of the Testaments upon the N.T.

5. *Levi and Judah*

In a considerable number of apocalyptical passages Levi and Judah are mentioned together. As has been said before, the present author assumed in 1952 that these passages were composed by a Christian author in accordance with a clear common pattern which glorified Levi's priesthood and Judah's kingship and which was adapted to Christian needs in a variety of ways. He mentioned Jub. XXXI, 12-21 and Original Test. Naphtali (comp. Hebr. T.N. I, 8-10 and VII, 6) as possible sources. After the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls the whole matter had to be reconsidered because these passages (as many scholars have pointed out) resemble those in the writings of Qumran where a priestly and a kingly Messiah are mentioned. We must, therefore, undertake a fresh discussion of the texts concerned.

VAN DER WOUDE follows G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY who tried to demonstrate that "the juxtaposition of the Messiah from Judah and the Messiah from Levi is too deeply rooted in the fabric of the book for either element to be discarded" [3]) and he draws the conclusion: "Aus den messianischen Texten der Test. XII ergibt sich unzweideutig, dass in der Urschrift von zwei messianischen Gestalten die Rede war, d.h. vom Messias aus Levi und vom Messias aus Juda. Somit entsprechen die messianischen Vorstellungen der

---

[1]) In *Journal of Theological Studies* XV, 1914, p. 599 and *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. Foakes Jackson and Lake, II, London 1922, pp. 77 f.

[2]) *Expository Times*, LXIII, p. 257 and LXVII, p. 201. ARGYLE also assumes a parallel between T. Jos. VIII, 3 and Mark xiv 52. This is, however, not a clear case of parallelism, because Gen. xxxix 11-20 tells us several times that Joseph had to leave his garment in the hands of Potiphar's wife, and consequently he had to flee γυμνός (which does not only mean "naked" but also "lightly clad").

[3]) "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Journal of Theological Studies* XLVIII, 1947, pp. 1-12. Quotation from p. 1.

Test. XII denen der Qumrānschriften" [1]). PHILONENKO reaches a similar conclusion along different lines. He too finds a "double messianisme" in several passages of the Testaments which agree with 1 QS and 1 QSa which expect two Messiahs. In other texts however, belonging to a later stage in the composition of the Testaments these two Messiahs have been joined to form one single Messiah who is son of Levi as well as son of Judah. A similar expectation we find in CDC which also knows only one Messiah. This Messiah is the Teacher of Righteousness [2]).

We cannot discuss here the many and intricate problems connected with the messianic expectations in Qumran and their possible development, but shall content ourselves with a discussion of the passages of the Testaments which are used to shed light upon these problems. We shall start with T. Jud. XXIV which is mentioned first by PHILONENKO[3]) and occupies a prominent place in VAN DER WOUDE's demonstration [4]).

Both authors point out that Num. xxiv 17 plays an important part in the messianic texts of Qumran. CDC VII, 18-21; 1 QM XI, 6 and 4 Q Test. 12, perhaps also 1 QSb V, 27 may be mentioned in this connection. Also T. Jud. XXIV, 1 goes back to this verse, but the author knew it obviously in its LXX-form. We read: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακὼβ ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός μου, comp. Num. xxiv 17, LXX: ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ, ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ (and *v.* 7 ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ) and Hebr. דָּרַךְ כּוֹכָב מִיַּעֲקֹב וְקָם שֵׁבֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל. How can this important difference between T. Jud. XXIV and the writings of Qumran be explained if T. Jud. XXIV is to come from the same sect as these writings? For PHILONENKO no difficulty seems to exist at all: "Mais l'original hébreu de notre texte était sans doute fidèle à la leçon du texte masorétique", he says. He thinks that the author of T. Jud. XXIV used a florilegium of passages from Scripture dealing with the שֵׁבֶט, because he seems to refer to Is. xi

---

[1]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 215-216.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, p. 10. Compare A. DUPONT-SOMMER, *Nouveaux Aperçus* . . ., Paris 1953, p. 83: "Le chapitre XVIII du Testament de Lévi, selon moi, est sans doute le premier témoin de cette messianisation du Maître de justice".

[3]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 8-12.

[4]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 206-209.

and Ps. xlv too. It is quite probable that such a florilegium was used but it cannot be proved that שֵׁבֶט was the key word [1]).

According to VAN DER WOUDE T.Jud. XXIV, 1 is from the hand of a Christian author who read the reference to the Star from Jacob in Num. xxiv 17a and added the following words from the LXX, changing the text before him in such a way that it became a prophecy concerning Jesus Christ. VAN DER WOUDE finds a reference to the remainder of Num. xxiv 17a in T.Jud. XXIV, 5 τότε ἀναλάμψει σκῆπτρον βασιλείας μου and concludes that the original text of this chapter spoke of two Messiahs. As a parallel he mentions CDC VII, 18 ff. where two messianic figures are derived from Num. xxiv 17. In other words: VAN DER WOUDE regards T.Jud. XXIV in its present form as Christian, but he thinks that it is possible to reconstruct the original text which taught the "double messianism" found in the writings of Qumran [2]). If, he asks, in *v.* 1 and *v.* 5 the same person is referred to, why do we find the τότε at the beginning of *v.* 5? He points out that the Armenian version which gives a much shorter text, nowhere clearly betrays Christian influence. "Schon daher wäre man genötigt A von vornherein vorzuziehen".

It is clear that T.Jud. XXIV can be divided into two parts and it is quite likely that, originally, this passage dealt with the task attributed to Judah and the rôle played by Levi. But it seems to me an impossible undertaking to reconstruct the original text and to use this original text as new evidence for the messianic expectations of the sect of Qumran. If we examine the beginning of T.Jud. XXIV, 5 which, according to VAN DER WOUDE goes back to the second part of Num. xxiv 17a in the Hebrew, we find that the only word to support this supposition is σκῆπτρον (which in the LXX is used very often as a translation of שֵׁבֶט). Ἀναλάμψει (translated by VAN DER WOUDE with "aufgehen", but "aufleuchten"

---

[1]) In 1 QS V, 24-28 which is quoted as a proof for the existence of such an anthology by PHILONENKO (following J. DANIÉLOU and D. BARTHÉLEMY) the situation is different. There, in line 24 a clear reference to the שֵׁבֶט of Is. xi 4 is found.

[2]) A similar opinion is expressed by R. H. CHARLES in his Commentary on the Testaments, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs translated from the Editor's Greek text etc.*, London 1908, *in loc.* See also W. H. BROWNLEE, "Messianic motifs of Qumran and the New Testament", *New Testament Studies* III, 1956-'57, p. 197 n. 3 and H. KOSMALA, *Hebräer-Essener-Christen*, Leiden 1959, p. 82. BROWNLEE nor KOSMALA give an analysis of this chapter.

would have been better) is not a probable translation of קָם [1]) and the combination of σκῆπτρον βασιλείας in *v.* 5 with ῥάβδος δικαιοσύνης in *v.* 6 points in the direction of Ps. xlv 7 where we read: שֵׁבֶט מִישׁוֹר שֵׁבֶט מַלְכוּתֶךָ (LXX: ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου) [2]). Nor does the Armenian version give any support to VAN DER WOUDE's theory. The Armenian equivalent of τότε is not found in the beginning of *v.* 5, but in *v.* 4 and there is not much in the Armenian text of *vv.* 1 and 5 to suggest a reference to Num. xxiv 17. In CHARLES's retranslation into Greek we read καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνατελεῖ τὸ ἄστρον εἰρήνης τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης (*v.* 1) .... καὶ ἀναλάμψει σκῆπτρον βασιλείας μου (var. lect. θαλλήσει ἀπὸ σκήπτρου, *v.* 5) [3]).

We must now discuss the question whether and where Christian influence is visible in this chapter. As CHARLES and PHILONENKO have pointed out the expressions συμπορευόμενος τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πραότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ and πᾶσα ἁμαρτία οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ (*v.* 1) need not be Christian, because they can be explained with the help of Ps. xlv 5, Zech. ix 9 and Ps. Sol XVII, 36—but, of course, it would not be surprising if they were. The most important passage with regard to the problem of Christian influence is, however, T.Jud. XXIV, 2-3: καὶ ἀνοιγήσονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐκχέαι πνεύματος εὐλογίαν πατρὸς ἁγίου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχεεῖ πνεῦμα χάριτος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔσεσθε αὐτῷ εἰς υἱοὺς ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ πορεύεσθε ἐν προστάγμασι αὐτοῦ πρώτοις καὶ ἐσχάτοις (text acc. to *b* which wrongly reads προστάγματι). VAN DER WOUDE finds here a reference to Joel iii 1-5 and remarks: "Weiter ist der Gedanke, dass der Geist des Messias (oder Gottes) in der Endzeit ausgegossen wird, in der spätjüdischen Literatur genügend belegt". Like Philonenko and Dupont-Sommer he mentions an interesting parallel from Qumran for the expression ἐν προστάγμασι αὐτοῦ πρώτοις καὶ ἐσχάτοις. In 1 QS IX, 10 משפטים הרשונים are mentioned, according to which the אנשי היחד

---

[1]) One could mention Job xxv, 3 (comp. XI, 7), where the LXX, however, differs completely from the Masoretic Text. See on this verse S. R. DRIVER G. B. GRAY, *The Book of Job*, Edinburgh 1921, p. 215.

[2]) See also the following verse: "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with oil of gladness above thy fellows". These two verses are quoted in Hebr. i 8-9 and applied to Jesus Christ.

[3]) On the value of the Armenian version as a whole, see p. 186 above.

valk until the arrival of a prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and srael (comp. CDC XX, 31). The "last commandments" which are ıot mentioned in 1 QS or CDC mast be those given in the last days ıfter the prophet has arrived [1]). This parallel is interesting, but we ;hould be cautious in accepting it as evidence for a common origin)f (the original text of) T.Jud. XXIV and the writings of Qumran. As M. A. CHEVALLIER has pointed out [2]), the expression "the first and the last" is well-known in the O.T. 1 Chron. xxix 29 speaks of וְדִבְרֵי דָוִיד הַמֶּלֶךְ הָרִאשֹׁנִים וְהָאַחֲרֹנִים. (LXX: οἱ λοιποὶ λόγοι τοῦ βασιλέως Δαυὶδ οἱ πρότεροι καὶ οἱ ὕστεροι) and 2 Chron. ix 29 of וְשְׁאָר דִּבְרֵי שְׁלֹמֹה הָרִאשֹׁנִים וְהָאַחֲרֹנִים (LXX: καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι λόγοι Σαλωμὼν οἱ πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι). It is quite possible, therefore, that the expression in T.Jud. XXIV, 3 means simply "all commandments, from the first till the last". It is important to note, that T.Jud. XXIV, 2-3 speaks of the spirit of the *Holy Father*, tells us that the *Messiah pours down the spirit of grace* and that the believers *will be his sons in truth* (expressions spaced in the Greek text given above). Close parallels to these conceptions are found in T.L. XVIII, 6-9 which reads: (6) οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀνοιγήσονται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς δόξης ἥξει ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἁγίασμα μετὰ φωνῆς πατρικῆς ὡς ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ πατρὸς Ἰσαάκ (7) καὶ δόξα ὑψίστου ἐπ' αὐτὸν ῥηθήσεται καὶ πνεῦμα συνέσεως καὶ ἁγιασμοῦ καταπαύσει ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι (8) αὐτὸς δώσει τὴν μεγαλωσύνην κυρίου τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ οὐκ ἔσται διαδοχὴ αὐτῷ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος.

PHILONENKO (who, strangely enough, does not discuss T.L. XVIII, 6-8 anywhere at length) points to 1 QSb I, 3-5 to explain T.Jud. XXIV, 2a. In this passage, belonging to the benedictions for the faithful, we read the prayer: "May the L[ord] bless thee [from His holy dwelling] and may He open for you from heaven the eternal source which shall not [fail] . . . . and may He favour thee with all blessing[s of heaven and may he ?] thee with the knowledge of holy ones". No parallel is mentioned for πατρὸς ἁγίου. As parallel to *v* 2b he rightly points to Zech. xii 10 where God says: καὶ ἐκχεῶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Δαυὶδ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦν-

---

[1]) So VAN DER WOUDE, *op. cit.*, p. 75 n. 3. In CDC XX, 8, 9 ראשונים and אחרונים are mentioned together, but it is not sure that משפטים is the accompanying substantive; the translation is uncertain.

[2]) *L'Esprit et le Messie* . . . ., p. 118 n. 4.

τας Ἰερουσαλὴμ πνεῦμα χάριτος καὶ οἰκτιρμοῦ (LXX, not differing from Hebr.). He does not offer an explanation for the fact that in T. Jud. XXIV the Messiah and not God is the subject, but only states the fact: "C'est le Maître lui-même, et non Yahvé, qui répand l'Esprit de grâce". 1 QH VII, 20 is mentioned as parallel to *v.* 3a: "Thou hast set me as a father to them Thou holdest dear" [1]).

It is to be regretted that PHILONENKO has not dealt with the present author's discussion of T. Jud. XXIV and T.L. XVIII on pp. 89-90 of *The Testaments* and with M. A. CHEVALLIER's careful treatment of these passages on pp. 125-130 of his *L'Esprit et le Messie* [2]), especially as his own demonstration shows at least two serious lacunae: we have seen that he does not explain the expression πατρὸς ἁγίου and that he does not give any parallel from Qumran for the pouring down of the Spirit by the Messiah. The parallels between T. Jud. XXIV, 2-3 and T.L. XVIII, 6-8 and the accounts in the gospels of Jesus' baptism in the river Jordan are obvious (note especially ἐν τῷ ὕδατι in T.L. XVIII, 7 which CHARLES regarded as a Christian interpolation). CHEVALLIER writes: "La parenté du texte de T. Lévi avec les récits du baptême de Jésus est manifeste" [3]). He points out that here as well as in the gospel accounts Is. xi 2 plays an important part and that the "mise en scène" is the same in both cases. The heavens are opened, the Holy Spirit is given to the Messiah, a "fatherly" voice is heard, the Holy Spirit rests upon Him. Only the dove is missing from the account in the Testaments. It can be demonstrated that T. Levi is dependent on the New Testament. In the New Testament the voice declares: "Thou art my son" whereas T. Levi contents itself with an allusion: μετὰ φωνῆς πατρικῆς..

The account in T. Jud. XXIV is shorter than the story in T. Levi but the same elements are found there, and it is clearly Christian too. With regard to T. Jud. XXIV, 2b CHEVALLIER mentions

[1]) PHILONENKO mentions also a number of passages where the expression בני אמת occurs; those, however, do not give an exact parallel and need not detain us here.

[2]) The rhetorical question in note 40 on p. 11 can hardly be called a refutation of the views put forward by CHEVALLIER and the present author: "Faut-il préciser que l'auteur du *Testament de Juda* ne fait aucunement allusion, comme le voudraient DE JONGE, *op. cit.*, p. 90 et M.-A. CHEVALLIER, *op. cit.* 130 au baptême du Christ au Jourdain? Ce sont les évangiles qui utiliseront ce motif à nouveau et dans un tout autre cadre".

[3]) *Op. cit.*, p. 129.

Zech. xii 10 and Is. xliv 3 and adds: "Mais jamais dans le Judaïsme l'effusion de l'Esprit n'a été rapportée au Messie; ce point précis est strictement Chrétien" [1]).

The fact that the Testaments call the believers sons of the Messiah presents many difficulties to all interpreters. CHEVALLIER remarks: "un tel rapport entre Messie et fidèles n'a aucun précédent connu et n'est en tout cas concevable que dans une perspective chrétienne". He thinks it possible that a messianic interpretation of Is. xliv 3 (*thy* seed, *thine* offspring) led to this unusual conception. The present author tried to explain it as an example of the vagueness of the Christology of the Testaments which we find in more cases [2]). 1 QH VII, 20, mentioned by PHILONENKO, does not give an exact parallel because the relationship between the faithful and the author is here compared with various human relationships, viz. that of father and children, nurse and young people, mother and babies. VAN DER WOUDE refers to Ecclus. L, 12 f. where the priests who surround the highpriest are called his sons (so Hebr.; Gr. and Syr.: brothers) [3]). None of these explanations is entirely satisfactory.

Our conclusion with regard to T. Jud. XXIV must be that this is a Christian passage in which possibly material from the Qumran sect (or a related group) has been incorporated. The redaction of T. Jud. XXIV has been so thorough, however, that it is impossible to reconstruct the pre-Christian text of the passage. Consequently there is little in this chapter that can elucidate the messianology of Qumran.

The same can be said of T.L. XVIII. VAN DER WOUDE discusses this chapter on pp. 210-214 of his book. He assumes that this chapter was redacted and interpolated in the same way as T. Jud. XXIV, and he thinks that it is possible to reconstruct the original pre-Christian text though this is far more difficult here than in the case of T. Jud. "Doch scheint es mir möglich, auch in T. Levi XVIII der Urform des Textes, wenigstens im grossen und ganzen auf die Spur zu kommen". VAN DER WOUDE begins with removing a number of interpolations. He regards ἕως ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ in *v.* 3, ἐν τῷ ὕδατι in *v.* 7 and ὁ δὲ Ἰσραήλ ἐλαττωθήσεται ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ

[1]) We can think e.g. of the Paraclete-passages in John xiv-xvi.
[2]) *The Testaments*, p. 90 and pp. 125 f.; comp. John xiv, 18.
[3]) *Op. cit.*, p. 214; compare, perhaps, 1 Q 5b III, 2: "Thy seed".

καὶ σκοτισθήσεται ἐν πένθει in *v.* 9 as Christian additions and declares: "Übrigens kann man nicht behaupten die Perikope sei christlich". It does not become clear how he can justify his treatment of this chapter in the light of his earlier criticism of the interpolation-theory advocated by CHARLES and BOUSSET. He seems to make the same mistake as these scholars when he removes the obvious Christian expressions and regards the remaining part of the chapter as not necessarily Christian! [1]).

In T.L. XVIII, 1, 2 VAN DER WOUDE finds the contrast between the old wicked priesthood and the new perfect priest from the tribe of Levi, a contrast which is also found or implied in other passages of this Testament. It is remarkable, however, that it is nowhere explicitly stated in T.L. XVIII that the new priest will belong to the tribe of Levi whereas in T. Jud. XXIV, 1 the messianic figure is said to come ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός μου. The expression τότε ἐγερεῖ κύριος ἱερέα καινόν, ᾧ πάντες οἱ λόγοι κυρίου ἀποκαλυφθήσονται .... in *v.* 2 agrees excellently with a Christology like that found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The same can be said of the beginning of *v.* 3 καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον αὐτοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὡς βασιλεύς: The priest of the last days is at the same time king! [2]).

V. 3b φωτίζων φῶς γνώσεως has been derived from Hos. x 12b LXX. VAN DER WOUDE admits this, but in stead of assuming Christian redaction in this verse which ends with the Christian phrase ἕως ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ, he tries to explain the agreement with the LXX with the hypothesis that the author knew the Hebrew original of the LXX-text. "Es ist sicher, dass die Qumrangemeinde einen der Septuaginta ähnlichen Bibeltext gekannt hat". It is, indeed, theoretically possible that the Qumran sect possessed a Hebrew MS which read the Hebrew equivalent of

---

[1]) See also p. 184 above.

[2]) So also M.-A. CHEVALLIER, *op. cit.*, p. 131 n. 1. VAN DER WOUDE *op. cit.*, pp. 212 f. suggests two possible explanations of T.L. XVIII, 3a a) It is a Christian addition, see Ignatius, Eph. XIX, 2 and Justin. Dial CVI, 4, which connects Num. xxiv 17 and Matt. ii 2 (mentioned in *Th Testaments*, p. 154, n. 255); b) a royal star as apocalyptical sign of heaven i referred to. By way of illustration he mentions Matt. xxiv 30, Rev. xi 1-3, Ass. Mos. X, 9, none of which gives an exact parallel. He conclude by saying: "Jedenfalls kann V, 3a nicht beweisen, dass T. Levi XVIII 1-9 nicht vom levitischen Messias die Rede sei", He forgets to explain wh the star which, according to his theory, is always connected with the priestl Messiah, in T. Jud. XXIV as well as in Qumran, is here connected with King.

φωτίζων φῶς γνώσεως in Hos. x 12b, but this does not seem very likely [1]). Hos. x 12c is used in CDC VI, 11 to give support to the expectation of the eschatological Teacher of Righteousness. We read: עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים which goes back to the עַד־יָבוֹא וְיוֹרֶה צֶדֶק לָכֶם of the Masoretic Text, but does not agree with the ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν γεννήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῖν in the LXX. Unless we assume that one Hebrew text was used in T.L. XVIII, 3 and another in CDC VI, 11, or suppose the existence of a mixed text, we cannot explain the peculiar quotation in T.L. XVIII, 3b. It is much easier to assume that the wording of this passage was derived directly from the LXX.

T.L. XVIII, 6-8 has been discussed above; it must be regarded as a Christian passage. It certainly contains more Christian elements than the ἐν τῷ ὕδατι deleted by VAN DER WOUDE as a Christian interpolation.

The only passage from T.L. XVIII which is discussed at some length by PHILONENKO is T.L. XVIII, 9 [2]). He pays special attention to the words ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερωσύνης αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔθνη πληθυνθήσονται ἐν γνώσει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and he mentions as a parallel 1 QpHab. XI, 1 ואחר תגלה להם הדעת כמי היים לרב (which comments on Hab. ii 14). This parallel does not seem quite apposite. It is improbable, if not impossible that this refers to the Gentiles; the text is defective, but immediately before and immediately after this passage the conflict between the sect and its Jewish opponents is dealt with [3]). With regard to the following passage καὶ φωτισθήσονται διὰ χάριτος κυρίου, ὁ δὲ Ἰσραὴλ ἐλαττωθήσεται ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ καὶ σκοτισθήσεται ἐν πένθει PHILONENKO points to the

---

[1]) See also p. 195 n. 1 above. It should be noted that in the case of the LXX-quotation of Num. xxiv 17 in T. Jud XXIV VAN DER WOUDE does not hesitate to assume Christian redaction.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, p. 27. About T.L. XVIII in general he writes: "Cet hymne, comme l'a montré A. DUPONT-SOMMER, magnifie le Maître de Justice".

[3]) See also H. KOSMALA, *op. cit.*, pp. 395-397. PHILONENKO also mentions 1 QMyst. I, 7 and 1 QH VI, 12. The first passage contains a general statement to the effect that knowledge shall fill the earth like justice and that evil shall disappear; it does not speak specifically about the fate of Jews and Gentiles. The passage from the Hodayot is more explicit on this point. According to KOSMALA this passage is mainly concerned with the past; he points to *Qumran Cave I*, 34 bis 3, col. II, 3 ff., where we read that the זרע אדם does not know God and acts wickedly, in contrast to the chosen people, and concludes: "Die Situation ist die gleiche, die Paulus in Rom. i 18-32 beschreibt. See also p. 198 above.

opposition between the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem (which are condemned by the sect) and the chosen few at Qumran (see e.g. CDC III, 13-14, XVI, 3). Again this parallel is not apposite. The contrast is here clearly not between two groups within the Jewish people, but between the Jews and the Gentiles. T.L. XVIII, 9 does not seem to render support to the hypothesis of the Essene origin of T.L. XVIII.

Though T.L. XVIII is Christian in its present form, it may contain elements which come from the Qumran sect or a related group. VAN DER WOUDE points to the fact that the messianic figure in this chapter gives instruction and knowledge (*vv.* 2, 3, 7, 9) like the יורה הצדק in CDC VI, 10 f. and to the reference to Mal. iii 20 in *v.* 4, a verse that stands near to iii 23 which announces the return of Elijah (whom, according to VAN DER WOUDE, the sect identified with the highpriest of the last days). Again, however, the redactor has done his work so thoroughly that it is very difficult to find the pre-Christian and possibly Essene elements.

We must now proceed to an examination of other passages which deal with the position of Levi and Judah. The first is T. Jud. XXI, 1-5, especially the verses 2 and 3, which read in *b*: ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἔδωκε κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν κἀκείνῳ (Levi) τὴν ἱερατείαν, καὶ ὑπέταξε τὴν βασιλείαν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ. ἐμοὶ ἔδωκε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐκείνῳ τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. With this we may compare the fragment 1 Q 21, 1 [1]) attributed to a Testament of Levi כהנותא רבא מן]מלכות and 1 QSa II, 11-12 which states clearly that the high priest is higher in rank than the Messiah of Israel. We should note, however, that T. Jud. XXI does not speak of messianic figures from Levi and Judah but of the tribes themselves. The same is true of T. Iss. V, 7. Also in T. Gad. VIII, 1 the two tribes are mentioned: εἴπατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς ταῦτα τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, ὅπως τιμήσωσιν Ἰούδαν καὶ τὸν Λευί. The rest of this verse, unfortunately, presents us with a text-critical problem. In *b* we read ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ κυρίος σωτῆρα τῷ Ἰσραήλ (comp. *a e f*, *d* σωτήρ), which would point to an expectation of *one* saviour from the *two* tribes; *k*, *h i*, *g* and *Arm*, read, however, σωτηρίαν, *c* σωτηρία and this reading should be preferred as lectio difficilior [2]). Consequently

[1]) *Qumran Cave I*, p. 88.
[2]) So also VAN DER WOUDE, *op. cit.*, p. 197, n. 5.

lso in T. Gad. VIII, 1 the two tribes are glorified and not a nessianic figure [1]).

In T.N. VIII, 2-3 the patriarch tells his children to command heir offspring ἵνα ἑνοῦνται τῷ Λευὶ καὶ τῷ Ἰούδᾳ. After this only udah is mentioned: διὰ γὰρ τοῦ Ἰούδα ἀνατελεῖ σωτηρία τῷ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ εὐλογηθήσεται Ἰακώβ. διὰ γὰρ τοῦ σκήπτρου ὐτοῦ ὀφθήσεται Θεὸς κατοικῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς σῶαι τὸ γένος Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπισύναξει δικαίους ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν. VAN DER WOUDE is right in discovering here the hand of a Christian edactor [2]) who made Levi disappear all but completely and lorified Judah as the tribe from which Jesus Christ was born. Originally this passage must have connected salvation with the wo tribes; there is no indication that this original passage mentioned wo Messiahs. According to PHILONENKO [3]) the present Greek text speaks of the Teacher of Righteousness and he tries to prove his theory by referring to T. Jud. XXIV, 5-6, a passage which belongs to a chapter which was redacted by a Christian, as we have tried to demonstrate above.

T.R. VI, 5-12 and T.S. V, 4-6 present more difficulties. In T.R. VI, 5-12 Judah is only mentioned in passing. Reuben's children will be jealous of the children of Levi but God will protect the latter (*v.* 7): τῷ γὰρ Λευὶ ἔδωκε τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τῷ Ἰούδᾳ, μετ' αὐτῶν κἀμοὶ καὶ Δὰν καὶ Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ εἶναι ἐπὶ ἄρχοντας. In *The Testaments* p. 88 I thought that the original text only mentioned Levi and Judah. VAN DER WOUDE [4]), however, has pointed out that this combination of names goes back to Num. ii and may very well be original. He also points to 1 QSa II, 14 f. where after the highpriest and the priests the Messiah of Israel and the ראש [. . . . אל]פי ישראל are mentioned which are told to sit down according to their rank.

The tribe of Levi plays an important rôle in 1 QM; its members are leaders in the Holy War, see e.g. 1 QM XV, 4-8; XVI, 11-14; XVIII, 3-6. Levi dominates so much that the Prince of the congregation of 1 QM V, 1 remains a somewhat shadowy figure. This

[1]) W. H. BROWNLEE, *N.T.St.*, III, 1957, p. 197 thinks that also in the Testaments σωτηρία is a messianic title. But the only passage where it is probable that "salvation" is used with this meaning seems to be Isa. li 4-5 in 1 Q ISa.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 200 f.

[3]) *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

[4]) *Op. cit.*, p. 103 and p. 195, comp. also 1 QM III, 14.

shows a remarkable agreement with the situation presupposed in T.R. VI, 11, 12: αὐτὸς γὰρ εὐλογήσει τὸν 'Ισραὴλ καὶ τὸν 'Ιούδαν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐξελέξατο κύριος βασιλεῦσαι πάντων τῶν λαῶν. καὶ προσκυνήσατε τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανεῖται ἐν πολέμοις ὁρατοῖς καὶ ἀοράτοις καὶ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν βασιλεῦς αἰώνων (text acc. to *b*). VAN DER WOUDE rightly connects this verse with T.S. V, 4 f.: ἐώρακα γὰρ ἐν χαρακτῆρι γραφῆς 'Ενὼχ [1] ὅτι υἱοὶ ὑμῶν μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν πορνείᾳ φθαρήσονται καὶ ἐν Λευὶ ἀδικήσουσιν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἀλλ' οὐ δυνήσονται πρὸς Λευί, ὅτι πόλεμον κυρίου πολεμήσει, καὶ νικήσει πᾶσαν παρεμβολὴν ὑμῶν (text acc. to *b*).

In *The Testaments*, p. 89 I assumed that T.R. VI, 11b from ἐν αὐτῷ onwards and T.R. VI, 12 formed an additional note, to be connected with 'Ιούδαν. VAN DER WOUDE [2]) agrees with this; he thinks that *vv.* 11b-12 refer to Judah and regards T.R. VI, 5-12 as a typical Levi-Judah-passage. Because of T.S. V, 5 and the agreements with 1 QM I am now inclined to assume that also *vv.* 11b-12 originally spoke about Levi and its leadership in days of peace and war. We should note, however, that there are significant differences between the present text of T.R. VI and 1 QM. Levi is said to be king (a title which is nowhere applied to the highpriest or any other priest or priestly figure in the Scrolls and is even avoided to denote the Davidic Messiah [3]) and he "will die for us [4]) in visible and invisible wars". It does not seem rash to suppose here Christian influence again. The hand of the Christian redactor is also visible I think, in T.R. VI, 8. There we read: διὰ τοῦτο ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν ἀκουεῖν τοῦ Λευὶ ὅτι αὐτὸς γνώσεται νόμον κυρίου καὶ διαστέλλει (so *b k*; *c*, β-*b g k*, S διαστελεῖ; *h*, *g* A διατελεῖ) εἰς κρίσιν καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ παντὸς 'Ισραὴλ μέχρι τελειώσεως χρόνων ἀρχιερέως χριστοῦ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος.

---

[1]) For the "quotations" from Enoch in the Testaments, see *The Testaments*, p. 84.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, p. 195 f. Like CHARLES he regards ἐν αὐτῷ ἐξελέξατο as a Hebraism (בחר בו). It is also possible to translate ἐν as an ἐν instrumentale. The construction ἐκλέγομαι ἐν is quite common in the LXX—see 1 Sam. xv 9-10; 1 Kings viii 44; xi 32; 1 Chron. xxviii 4, 5; 2 Chron. vi 5, 6; vii 12; Neh. ix 7. Consequently the use of this construction in this passage of the Testaments (if it is used) cannot prove that this was translated from a Semitic original; it may be a "Septuagintism".

[3]) See VAN DER WOUDE, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

[4]) So *c a b g*, A[b]; *h*, *e*, *f*, part of A, S, ὑμῶν. In V, 12b VAN DER WOUDE translates: "and among you will be a king in eternity". The translation "and he will be king among you in eternity" should, I think, be preferred

Translation and interpretation of the last clause (from μέχρι nwards) are difficult. Both the translation "until the consum- nation of the times of the (an) anointed highpriest, of whom the ord spoke "and the rendering "until the consummation of the imes of Christ the highpriest of whom the Lord spoke" are possible. f we choose the first translation we shall have to explain how the uthor can restrict Levi's activity to the period which precedes the consummation of the times, when a new highpriest will arise—who vill, no doubt, belong to the tribe of Levi! Or we may take χρόνων ἀρχιερέως χριστοῦ together and regard this as dependent on τελειώσεως so that the consummation of the times brings the end of the activity of the highpriest and (consequently) of Levi himself —but in that case we must suppose that the author makes a distinction between a "messianic age" and the "coming aeon", a distinction which is found nowhere else in the Testaments. The simplest interpretation is here, again, the Christian one. The Levitical priesthood will be succeeded by Christ as highpriest, as it is taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews; compare, esp. Hebr. vii 11, where we also find the word τελείωσις: εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευιτικῆς ἱερωσύνης ἦν, ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς νενομοθέτηται, τίς ἔτι χρεία κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν λέγεσθαι. This passage refers to Ps. cx 4, a text which may be alluded to in the ὃν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος of T.R. VI, 8 [1]).

---

[1]) We have already pointed out that T.L. XVIII, 1-3 also agrees with the Epistle of the Hebrews. This agreement is striking in T.L. VIII, 11-15, a passage which presents many difficulties. According to VAN DER WOUDE p. 213 this is not an eschatological but a historical passage, dealing with Moses, Aaron and the Zadokite priests, appointed by David. The explanation given in *The Testaments*, pp. 45-46 should, however, I think, still be preferred. A comparison with Isaac's blessing in Jub. XXXI, 15, 16 renders it probable that Or. Test. Levi spoke of the three offices (*v.* 11a) which are mentioned in *v.* 17. In *vv.* 11b (or 12)—15 we find a later Christian interpretation of the three ἀρχαί which forgets that these offices are to be contemporary and confined to the tribe of Levi. *V.* 12 deals with Abraham, the believer, *v.* 13 with the Aaronitic priesthood, and *vv.* 14-15 with the priestly and kingly office of Jesus Christ.

H. KOSMALA has made some important remarks about the relationship of the Testaments and the Epistle to the Hebrews on pp. 81-91 of his book. He thinks that Hebrews was addressed to people belonging to the circles in which the Testaments originated. He realizes that there are many and intricate problems concerning the relationship between the christian and non-Christian elements in the Testaments, but writes: "Selbst wenn eine kommende kritische Textarbeit einwandfrei feststellen würde, dass die

It is obvious that we are not allowed to speak of a juxtapositior of Levi and Judah in T.R. VI and T.S. V—the latter passage is in marked contrast to T.S. VII, 1-2 (to be discussed presently) which is entirely in keeping with the common pattern found in the other L.J.-passages [1]). Levi is by far the most influential and important person and Judah is hardly mentioned. The same picture emerges from T. Levi. Whereas in T. Jud. XXI Levi and Judah are mentioned side by side (whereby Levi takes precedence of Judah) in T. Levi Judah is very insignificant. He is mentioned in VIII, 14 which we recognized as a Christian passage [2]). Next, in IX, 1 where Judah pays a visit to Isaac together with his father and Levi. In Jub. XXXI we are told how Isaac blessed his two grandchildren on this occasion, but T.L. IX (which goes back to material found in Or. Test. Levi [3]) only mentions Levi and seems to forget about Judah, whose blessing is recorded in his own Testament, viz. in T. Jud. XVII, 5.

The third passage in T. Levi which mentions Judah is II, 11 καὶ διὰ σοῦ καὶ Ἰούδα ὀφθήσεται κύριος ἐν ἀνθρώποις, σώζων ἐν αὐτοῖς (so *b k*, others ἐν ἑαυτῷ) πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων. This verse belongs to a passage in which an angel who appears to Levi in a vision assures him: σύνεγγυς κυρίου στήσῃ καὶ λειτουργὸς αὐτοῦ ἔσῃ, καὶ μυστήρια αὐτοῦ ἐξαγγελεῖς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κηρύξεις (*v.* 10) and tells him καὶ ἐκ μερίδος κυρίου ἡ ζωή σου καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου ἀγρός ἀμπελών, καρποί, χρυσίον, ἀργυρίον (*v.* 12). It is remarkable that *vv.* 10 and 12 speak about Levi alone, and *v.* 11 about Levi and Judah; moreover in *v.* 10 Levi will proclaim concerning him who will save Israel, whilst *v.* 11 speaks of the salvation of πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων. We may suppose that T.L. II, 11 was added later probably when a later redactor tried to fit Or. Test. Levi into the framework of the twelve Testaments. The passages which glorify

---

eine oder andere der obenerwähnten Wendungen aus den Testamenten Levi und Reuben von einer christlichen Hand nachträglich eingefügt worden sind, so bleibt immer noch die priestlich-messianische Atmosphäre übrig die von einzelnen Ausdrücken nicht abhängig ist" (p. 88).

[1]) It should be noted that in T.S. V, 6 Jacob's prophecy concernin Simeon and Levi in Gen. xlix 7 is altered: The sons of Simeon (not those o Levi) will be few in number and will be divided in Levi and *Judah* (Ger xlix 7 Jacob, par. Israel).

[2]) See p. 211 n. 1.

[3]) See *The Testaments*, p. 39.

Levi and Judah seem to belong to a later stage in the composition of the Testaments; in Or. Test. Levi they did not occur, but at least one of them was found in Or. Test. Naphtali [1]). We shall return to this later [2]).

VAN DER WOUDE [3]) is of the opinion that T.L. II, 10-12 does not betray any Christian influence; κύριος in *v.* 11 refers to God, as in *v.* 10. "Er wird mittels Levi und Juda der ganzen Menschheit erscheinen, mehr besagt *v.* 11 nicht. In Levi und Juda findet Gott demnach die Organe zur Herbeiführung der endgültigen Erlösung". In *The Testaments*, p. 50 I called T.L. II, 11 "undoubtedly Christian", because I assumed at that time that the composition of the Testaments had been the work of one man, who in view of the many Christian passages could only have been a Christian. At present, after modifying my theory about the history of the composition of the Testaments, I take a slightly different view of T.L. II, 11 too. No doubt the Christian who gave the collection of Testaments its final form, regarded T.L. II, 11 as a prophecy concerning Jesus Christ. It is not clear, however, whether he is responsible for the present redaction of this verse; it is possible that T.L. II, 11 was given its present form and place by one of the Jewish redactors in the history of the Testaments, who, of course, interpreted it in his own way.

Three Levi-Judah-passages still remain to be discussed: T.S. VII, 1-2; T.D. V, 4, 10 and T. Jos. XIX, 8, 11. As we have seen T.S. VII, 1-2 differs entirely from T.S. V, 4-6 discussed above. It reads: καὶ νῦν, τεκνία μου, ὑπακούετε Λευὶ καὶ ἐν Ἰούδα λυτρωθήσεσθε καὶ μὴ ἐπαίρεσθε ἐπὶ τὰς δύο φυλὰς ταύτας, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν τὸ σωτηρίον τοῦ Θεοῦ. ἀναστήσει γὰρ κύριος ἐκ τοῦ Λευὶ ὡς ἀρχιερέα, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰούδα ὡς βασιλέα, θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον. οὕτως (so *b k*, other MSS οὗτος) σώσει πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. It is clear that in the present text the coming of one messianic figure is predicted; it is equally

---

[1]) See pp. 196 f. above.

[2]) H. KOSMALA, *op. cit.*, p. 82 writes: "Viele Anzeichen deuten jedoch darauf hin, dass die Zweiämterlehre eine spätere Phase in der Entwicklung des messianischen Denkens darstellt". He mentions the special position of T. Levi, the only testament, "welches seinen Stamm selbst und seine besondere Aufgabe für das Wohl Gesamtisraels zum Gegenstand hat ... Levi Mittlerrolle zwischen Gott und Israel ist über allen Zweifel erhaben und seine endzeitliche Funktion ist entscheidend".

[3]) *Op. cit.*, p. 200.

clear that Levi and Judah were mentioned separately in the original form of the passage. PHILONENKO [1]) regards this as convincing evidence in support of his theory that in the sect of Qumran the two Messiahs were gradually united into one, the Teacher of Righteousness. "Mais quand, plus tard, furent réunis sur un seul et même personnage — le Maître de justice—les attributs sacerdotaux et les attributs royaux, le texte fut retouché". Even the expression θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον must go back to the Hebrew (Essene) original. "Le Messie attendu est prêtre et roi, Dieu et homme. Sim. VI, 7 et Benj. X, 7-9 nous ont préparé à comprendre une telle formule". Neither here nor in his commentary on the two passages which he mentions PHILONENKO adduces any parallels from the Qumran writings which can support his supposition. We shall do well to regard θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον as a Christian expression. VAN DER WOUDE [2]) removes this as a Christian interpolation together with the οὕτως .... Ἰσραήλ-clause (because πάντα τὰ ἔθνη are mentioned before τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ). He thinks that the original passage predicted the coming of a high-priest from Levi and of a king from Judah, as instruments in God's hand to bring about the messianic salvation. In the L.J.-passages discussed so far, however, we have found that originally only the two tribes were mentioned, not two Messiahs springing from these tribes, and it is, indeed, probable that the same expectation was found in the passage underlyving T.S. VII, 1-2. *V.* 2 tells us that the Lord will send ὡς ἀρχιερέα and ὡς βασιλέα. The double ὡ sis not translated by VAN DER WOUDE; how we should translate it is not quite certain, but in view of the Christian context it seems likely that the Christian redactor wanted to indicate that Jesus Christ was highpriest and king in a very special way and that, therefore, his relation to Levi and Judah which were mentioned in the text before him was a very special one.

T.D. V, 4 speaks, again, about the tribes of Levi and Judah: οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἀποστήσεσθε τοῦ κυρίου καὶ προσωχθιεῖτε τὸν Λευὶ καὶ πρὸς Ἰούδαν ἀντιτάξεσθε, ἀλλ' οὐ δυνήσεσθε πρὸς αὐτούς· ἄγγελος γὰρ κυρίου ὁδηγεῖ ἑκατέρου ὅτι ἐν αὐτοῖς στήσεται Ἰσραήλ. In this passage there is nothing specifically Christian. In T.D. V, 10, however, the situation is more complicated. It reads: καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἐκ τῆς φυλῆ

[1]) *Op. cit.*, p. 43.
[2]) *Op. cit.*, p. 199.

Ἰούδα καὶ Λευὶ τὸ σωτήριον κυρίου καὶ αὐτὸς ποιήσει πρὸς τὸν Βελίαρ πόλεμον κτλ. Because of the transition from τὸ σωτήριον to αὐτὸς, *v.* 11a and *v.* 13b I assumed Christian redaction and supposed that the αὐτὸς referred to Jesus Christ.[1]). VAN DER WOUDE[2]) does not agree with this. According to him the αὐτὸς refers to God, and ἀνατελεῖ must be taken as transitive and not as intransitive. Consequently he does not find any trace of Christian influence in *vv.* 10-13 (at most ψυχὰς ἁγίων in *v.* 11 is of Christian origin). Strict proof cannot be given and it is difficult to make a final decision. Possibly this is one of those passages which were written by a Jew, and adopted with few or no alterations by the Christian redactor who interpreted it differently. VAN DER WOUDE remarks about this verse: "Die Stellung der Erlösergestalten aus Juda und Levi wird nicht recht deutlich; eine wichtige Rolle spielen sie jedenfalls nicht; offenbar sind sie nur die Organe Gottes in der Endzeit". In fact, T.D. V does not speak about "Erlösergestalten" at all; in this chapter the tribes themselves are (or were originally, if we adopt the Christian interpretation of *v.* 10) mentioned as instruments in God's hand.

T. Jos. XIX is an extremely complicated chapter. First there are problems with regard to the text. *Vv.* 3-7 of this chapter are only found in the Armenian translation and the Armenian of *vv.* 8-12 differs considerably from the Greek. VAN DER WOUDE prefers the longer Armenian text and his arguments certainly deserve careful consideration[3]). More important, however, are *vv.* 8-12. In A there is a clear connection between *vv.* 8-10 and the preceding verses. This passage speaks about a virgin between the horns[4]) and those horns are clearly those of the fourth bull (= Judah) in *v.* 6. In this verse we are told that the horns of this bull went up to heaven and became as a wall for the flocks. *V.* 6b also mentions another horn which grows between the two horns just mentioned, but its function is not specified. In *v.* 8 the virgin gives birth to a lamb that conquers all evil powers (symbolized by beasts and reptiles) to the joy of the bulls, the cow and the harts

[1]) See *The Testaments*, pp. 87, 91 ff.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 196, 205 f.

[3]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 201-204. See also *The Testaments*, pp. 28 f., where I considered it impossible to decide whether the shorter or the longer text is original.

[4]) A number of Armenian MSS reads "harts" instead of "horns". These two words are very similar in Armenian.

(all mentioned in the preceding verses). The picture is confused but it is clear that in *v.* 6 and *v.* 8 a messianic figure from Judah i referred to in various ways. Therefore it is strange that *v.* 1 suddenly speaks about Levi and Judah, and tells us that "from them shall arise the salvation of Israel". VAN DER WOUDE identifie Levi with the "one cow" mentioned in *v.* 5; it is said that twelv flocks and innumerable flocks drank of the sea of milk, produce by her. For this identification, however, there does not seem to b enough evidence [1]).

"In A ist mit Sicherheit nirgends christlicher Einfluss nach zuweisen" — so VAN DER WOUDE. It would, however, be very remarkable if a purely Jewish passage spoke of a *lamb*, born from a *virgin* from the tribe of Judah. In Eth. En. LXXX-XC mentioned as a parallel by VAN DER WOUDE and others, we do not find anything of that kind. There are still more difficulties in A: How are we to interpret the mysterious *v.* 7? And why does *v.* 9 mention harts which, according to *v.* 4, had been changed into sheep?

Because of the confusion in A it is difficult to suppose that it represents the original text or is nearer to it than the Greek which has a number of difficulties of its own. The connection between *v.* 2 and *v.* 8 in the Greek is strange. After the dispersion of (first) nine and (later) three lambs a virgin is born from Judah, which, in turn, gives birth to a lamb without blemish. This lamb which has "as it were a lion" on its left hand, destroys all beasts, to the joy of the angels, mankind and the whole earth (*v.* 9, comp. A). In *v.* 11 we read: ὑμεῖς οὖν, τέκνα μου, φυλάξατε τὰς ἐντολὰς κυρίου καὶ τιμᾶτε τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τὸν Λευί, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, χάριτι σώζων πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ (so *b*; *c* adds after Θεοῦ: ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου)—a clearly Christian redaction of the original passage which must have been very similar to the text found in A.

---

[1]) Literally translated this verse reads: "And after this I saw and, behold, twelve young bulls which were sucking one cow, which made a sea of the enormous milk and there drank thereof the twelve flocks and the innumerable flocks". VAN DER WOUDE connects this with 1 Cor. iii 2, Hebr. v 12f. and 1 Petr. ii 2, where milk is used to denote Christian (elementary) teaching. H. SCHLIER, *Th W z N T.*, I, pp. 644-645 gives a number of parallels from the mystery-religions and the gnosis, where milk is a sacramental element imparting ἀθανασία. I cannot find any connection between these Christian texts or the passages mentioned by SCHLIER and T. Jos. XIX, 5. In our verse we shall have to think of the wealth and fertility of the Holy Land (Exod. iii 8, 17 and often), especially at the end of days (Joel iii 18, Isa. lx 16).

Few things only may be said with reasonable certainty. First, that the present text has undergone Christian redaction, in the Greek as well as in the Armenian. Secondly, that *v.* 11 which speaks about Levi and Judah must belong to a later stage in the transmission of the text—comp. T.L. II, 10-12. Whilst in T.L. originally Levi was the prominent figure, here all emphasis is laid upon Judah. Thirdly, there is no reason to suppose that the original text spoke of messianic figures from Levi and Judah.

PHILONENKO discusses T. Jos. XIX, 8-11 under the suggestive title "L'Agneau de Dieu" [1]). Without discussing the textual problems he follows the Greek text and finds a parallel between T. Jos. XIX, 8 and Rev. XII, 1. The παρθένος of *v.* 8 is, according to him, the holy community from which the Messiah is born. The lamb is the Messiah from Levi, the lion the Messiah from Judah. He does not explain, unfortunately, how the lamb born of a virgin from *Judah* can be the Messiah from *Levi*. Also he does not pay attention to the strange transition from the ἐξ αὐτῆς in *v.* 8 to the ἐξ αὐτῶν (*c*: ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν) in *v.* 11. For his interpretation of the virgin as the holy community he tries to find support in A. DUPONT-SOMMER's interpretation of 1 QH III, 6-18 in his article "La Mère du Messie et la Mère de l'Aspic" [2]). Whatever may be thought of DUPONT-SOMMER's theory [3]), it is not at all evident that παρθένος has to be interpreted collectively in our passage.

Looking back upon our investigations in this section we may formulate the following conclusions:

1. In Or. Test. Levi all emphasis must have been laid on Levi, whereas Judah was mentioned only in passing. We might suppose that the author neglected Judah because he knew of a Testament of Judah—or had even written it himself—which glorified that patriarch. In the present Testament of Judah older material has undoubtedly been incorporated [4]), but we have reason to suppose that it received its present form, and was turned into a true Testament only at a later stage in the development of the Testaments. Moreover the present Testament also glorifies Levi and assigns the second place to its own patriarch. It is more probable,

---

[1]) Chapter VI, pp. 29-30.
[2]) *Revue d'Histoire des Religions*, 1955, pp. 174-188.
[3]) It is criticized severely by VAN DER WOUDE, *op. cit.*, pp. 144-156.
[4]) See *The Testaments*, pp. 60-71.

therefore, that the attitude of Or. Test. Levi has to be explained by the very strong priestly sympathies of its author.

2. The Levi-Judah-passages proper belong to a later stage in the history of the Testaments, at which the Testament of Judah certainly, and probably all other Testaments too were added to Or. Test. Levi and Or. Test. Naphtali. Quite likely Or. Test. Naphtali had already a Levi-Judah-passage, which may have served as an example when the twelve Testaments were composed.

3. In the original Levi-Judah-passages Levi is honoured more than Judah. It is remarkable that in T.R. VI, 5-12 Judah is kept in the background and that in T.S. V, 4-6 he is not mentioned at all. It is possible that in these two Testaments older material has been used by the author(s) who composed the twelve Testaments. It may not be entirely accidental that these two particular passages belong to the first two Testaments.

4. It is not likely that the original Levi-Judah-passages spoke about two Messiahs; they glorified the two tribes only.

5. In the present Testaments the L.J.-passages have been redacted in several ways in order to serve Christian interests. The Christian redaction belongs to yet a later stage in the composition of the Testaments.

6. The history of the composition of the Testaments is a very complicated one and only parts of it can be traced.

7. As to the problem of the relationship between the various passages of the Testaments and the messianic texts in the Qumran-documents no definite conclusions can be drawn. It seems to me that in the former as well as in the latter a variety of expectations is found. It does not seem possible to define exactly the historical and literary relationship between the material used in the composition of the Testaments and that found in the Dead Sea Scrolls —at least not in the light of our present knowledge. I do not think VAN DER WOUDE's theory (two Messiahs in the "Urschrift" of the Testaments, as well as in the Qumran documents) or PHILONENKO's point of view (two Messiahs in the first period of Qumran and the oldest stratum of the Testaments, one Messiah, the Teacher of Righteousness, later on) do justice to the complexity of the material found in the Testaments (and, we may add perhaps, of that in the Scrolls). PHILONENKO, moreover, has not succeeded in proving his contention that the Messiah spoken of in the Testaments is the Teacher of Righteousness.

5. *Further material in T. Levi*

With some exceptions VAN DER WOUDE deals in his book only with the passages discussed in § 5. PHILONENKO, however, tries to find support for his theory concerning the origin of the Testaments and to receive more information concerning the history of the Qumran sect and its Teacher in a great number of other passages.

In his second chapter [1]) he discusses T.L. X, XIV en XVI which according to him, belong to the passages that show many points of agreement with the Psalms of Solomon and were written about the beginning of the reign of Herod the Great. In *The Testaments* [2]) the present writer supposed that T.L. XIV-XV served as the model on which the other Sin-Exile-Return-passages in the Testaments were composed, and tried to demonstrate that these two chapters, in a not yet redacted form, belonged to Or. Test. Levi, whereas T.L. X and T.L. XVI, which have the same structure as T.L. XIV-XV and deal with the same subject were added later to fill the gaps caused by the omission of other Or. Test. Levi-material [3]). We cannot enter into this problem here, but will concentrate upon the question whether in these chapters the hand of a Christian redactor may be discovered.

Some of the parallels with passages from Qumran which are quoted by PHILONENKO are of such a general nature that no conclusions can be drawn from them. In connection with T.L. XVI, 1 καὶ τὰς θυσίας (α: τὰ θυσιαστήρια) μιανεῖτε for instance, he quotes CDC V, 6 (comp. IV, 18-19), 1 QpHab. XII, 8-9, passages which also speak of pollution of the sanctuary, but this is a very usual reproach to be addressed to wicked priests. With regard to the λόγους προφητῶν ἐξουθενώσητε in T.L. XVI, 2 PHILONENKO quotes CDC VII, 17-18 and in regard to the διώξετε ἄνδρας δικαίους καὶ εὐσεβεῖς μισήσητε 1 Qp Hab. X, 13, but, here again, the parallels are too general to give support to any theory whatever.

---

[1]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 13-18.

[2]) See pp. 40-42, and also pp. 83 ff.

[3]) This theory seems to be corroborated to some extent by the new fragments of the Aramaic Test. Levi found in Cave IV. See MILIK, *R.B.*, 1955, p. 399: "Parmi d'autres fragments du même ms, qui ne recoupent pas les textes araméens et grecs connus, il y en a un (ou plutôt deux rapprochés à distance) qui présente un certain intérêt pour la critique littéraire des *Test. XII Patr.*, puisqu'il correspond à T. Lévi XIV, 1 ss., donc à la partie que l'on considère souvent comme ajoutée postérieurement à l'ouvrage primitif".

Other parallels quoted by PHILONENKO are Qumran texts, tne exact meaning of which is still a matter of debate among scholars; most of these have been interpreted with the help of the Testaments-especially by A. DUPONT-SOMMER [1]). Consequently we find that DUPONT-SOMMER uses the Testaments to support his interpretation of certain texts from Qumran, whereas he and his pupil PHILONENKO use the same Qumran texts to prove that the Testaments are of Qumran origin. This method would not be objectionable if it were certain that extra-Qumran origin in general and that Christian redaction in particular might be excluded, but this, in fact, is not the case.

Important, in this connection, is T.L. XVI, 3-5: καὶ ἄνδρα ἀνακαινοποιοῦντα νόμον ἐν δυνάμει ὑψίστου πλάνον προσαγορεύσετε καὶ τέλος, ὡς νομίζετε, ἀποκτενεῖτε αὐτόν (instead of ὡς . . . αὐτόν α reads ὁρμήσετε τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν), οὐκ εἰδότες αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀνάστημα, τὸ ἀθῷον αἷμα ἐν κακίᾳ ἐπὶ κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν ἀναδεχόμενοι. δι' αὐτὸν ἔσται τὰ ἁγία ὑμῶν ἔρημα ἕως ἐδάφους μεμιαμμένα. καὶ οὐκ ἔσται τόπος ὑμῶν καθαρός, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔσεσθε εἰς κατάραν καὶ εἰς διασκορπισμόν, ἕως αὐτὸς πάλιν ἐπισκέψηται καὶ οἰκτειρήσας προσδέξηται ὑμᾶς ἐν πίστει καὶ ὕδατι (text acc. to *b*).

PHILONENKO identifies the ἄνδρα ἀνακαινοποιοῦντα νόμον ἐν δυνάμει ὑψίστου with the Teacher of Righteousness. This is not impossible in itself, and we must admit that this was not a usual expression to denote Jesus Christ—except, perhaps, in certain Jewish Christian groups. Still, there is much to be said in favour of a Christian redaction of this passage. In Matt. xxvii 63 Jesus is called ἐκεῖνος ὁ πλάνος (comp. John vii 12). The expression ὡς νομίζετε ἀποκτενεῖτε should be preferred to the α-text followed by PHILONENKO, because it is lectio difficilior and because of the quality of the MSS which support it [2]); this expression gives a good description of what happened to Jesus who conquered death [3]). Next, the phrase τὸ ἀθῷον αἷμα ἐν κακίᾳ ἐπὶ κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν

---

[1]) See A. DUPONT-SOMMER's publicatians mentioned p. 181 n. 2. His theories have been criticized severely by many scholars; see e.g. F. M. CROSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-119, pp. 167-173.

[2]) See *The Testaments*, p. 21.

[3]) οὐκ εἰδότες τὸ ἀνάστημα is translated by PHILONENKO and DUPONT-SOMMER as "ne sachant pas qu'il se relèverait". ἀναστήμα is, however, not found with the meaning of "resurrection" which is ascribed to it also in some MSS of the Armenian translation. It means a.o. "height, majesty, prominence" (see LIDDELL-SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v.).

ἀναδεχόμενοι in this context reminds us of Matt. xxvii 24, 25 [1]). In connection with *v.* 4 PHILONENKO refers to 1 QpHab. IX, 9-12 which speaks of the punishment of the wicked priest because of his sins against the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers, but does not mention the destruction of the temple, and Ps. Sol. II, 2 which speaks about the pollution of the sanctuary by the Gentiles, but not of destruction. It is quite likely that this passage was written by a Christian who regarded the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D. as a punishment for the crucifixion of Jesus by the Jews. In *v.* 5 the second advent of the central figure of this chapter is referred to. "C'est le Maître de justice qui, lors de sa Visite, accueillera ses fidèles"—so PHILONENKO. As parallel he mentions CDC VII, 21 where the expression בקץ פקודה הראשון occurs which is translated as "au temps de la première visite" (comp. the parallel passage XIX, 11). From the Testaments we may conclude, PHILONENKO thinks, that this first visitation also was a visitation by the Teacher and because, in his view, the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey is here referred to "une conclusion s'impose: aux yeux des sectaires le Maître de justice passait pour avoir été l'exécuteur du châtiment sur la ville sainte". The problem of the interpretation of the very difficult passages from CDC cannot be discussed. Even so, however, it is clear that PHILONENKO's theory rests upon a number of suppositions which find little support in the text, whereas a Christian interpretation does not require any hypothetical supposition. Likewise there is no reason to assume that the expression ἐν πίστει καὶ ὕδατι does not refer to Christian baptism, but to Essene lustrations.

Next, PHILONENKO discusses T.L. XIV, 1-2, 5-8 where, amongst others, the expressions ἀσεβήσητε ἐπὶ κύριον χεῖρας ἐπιβάλλοντες κτλ. (*v* 1) and οἵτινες ἐπιβαλοῦσι τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου (*v.* 2) occur. Neither the title κύριος nor the title σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου is used in the writings of Qumran to denote the Teacher of Righteousness [2]) and we should therefore suppose that these phrases, in their present form, refer to Jesus Christ. Not so PHILONENKO who assumes here a "majoration christolo-

[1]) See also Matt. xxvii 4; xxiii 35 and T. Zeb. II, 2, mentioned p. 192 n. 1. PHILONENKO points to 2 Sam. i 16; Ezek. xviii 3, Ps Philo Ant. VI, 11, but in none of these passages the persons concerned take the blood-guilt upon themselves—as in Matt. xxvii 25 and T.L. XVI, 13.

[2]) PHILONENKO admits this. In connection with the κύριος—title he

gique" [1]). We should note, however, that in this chapter and in the following one many expressions are found which are more likely to have originated in a Jewish milieu than in a Christian one, so that we may assume that the Christian redaction of this part of Or. Test. Levi has not been very thorough.

In T.L. X, 2 the expression σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου occurs again. In T.L. X, 3 we find the expression ἀλλὰ σχίσαι τὸ ἔνδυμα τοῦ ναοῦ ὥστε μὴ κατακαλύπτειν ἀσχημοσύνην ὑμῶν. According to PHILONENKO this would again refer to the events of 63 B.C., when Roman soldiers intruded into the temple. On this occasion, PHILONENKO says, undoubtedly also the temple-veil was rent. None of our sources, however, mentions that this actually happened. PHILONENKO also remarks that this text "nous introduit dans un monde de spéculations assez mystérieux: le Temple est ici considéré comme une personne, et le voile du Temple comme le vêtement du sanctuaire personnifié". He refers to p. 124 of *The Testaments* and p. 197 of J. DANIELOU's *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* [2]), but seems to overlook the fact that in both places only Christian parallels are mentioned.

In the third chapter of PHILONENKO's book [3]) T.L. IV is examined. It gives "précisions d'un grand prix sur la fin tragique—et jusqu' ici mystérieuse — du Maître de justice". At a later time the same material was used in the passion-story found in the synoptic gospels.

The methodical objections against PHILONENKO's theory, stated before, could all be repeated in an analysis of his treatment of this chapter; we shall not repeat them here. As to the details we may make the following remarks:

The expression ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τοῦ ὑψίστου in T.L. IV, 1 cannot be

---

refers to Ps. Sol. XVII, 32 where the messianic king is called χριστὸς κύριος. As this figure is called *His* anointed one in XVIII, 2, it is possible to suppose a deliberate or involuntary alteration from κυρίου to κύριος on the part of a Christian scribe. Comp. also Lam. IV, 20, LXX and Hebr.

[1]) Strangely enough PHILONENKO does not discuss T.L. XIV, 4 where we hear of τὸ φῶς τοῦ νόμου (*b k i*: κόσμου; d κόσμου καὶ νόμου) τὸ δοθὲν ἐν ὑμῖν εἰς φωτισμὸν παντὸς ἀνθρώπου.

[2]) Tournai, 1957. Several interpretations of Matt. xxvii 51 and parallel passages are found in early Christian literature. Part of the material is found on the page from *The Testaments* mentioned in the text and in Campbell BONNER's article "Two Problems in Melito's Homily on the Passion", *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXI, 1938, pp. 175-190.

[3]) *Op. cit.* pp. 19-21

explained with the help of a number of texts from the Hodayot which speak of the sufferings of the author. PHILONENKO rightly characterizes the expression in T.L. IV, 1 as "prémices d'une christologie patripassianiste" but forgets to demonstrate that such a messianology had found adherents in Qumran. Therefore we have to assume Christian influence here; the Christian redactor(s) of the Testaments who lived before the time of the great christological controversies inserted more "patripassianic" passages [1]).

In connection with T.L. IV, 2 .... καὶ γίνεσθαι αὐτῷ υἱὸν καὶ θεράποντα καὶ λειτουργὸν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ (comp. II, 10a) PHILONENKO rightly points to 1 QSb IV, 25, and in connection with T.L. IV, 3 φῶς γνώσεως φωτιεῖς ἐν Ἰακὼβ καὶ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἔσῃ παντὶ σπέρματι Ἰσραήλ to 1 QSb IV, 27, passages which belong to a formula for the blessing of the priests [2]). But here too, Christian redaction is visible in *v.* 4 where we read: .... ἕως ἐπισκεψήται κύριος πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σπλαγχνοῖς υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος. πλήν οἱ υἱοί σου ἐπιβαλοῦσι χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτὸν, τοῦ ἀνασκολοπίσαι αὐτόν. Here the period of Levi's priesthood is limited, as in T.R. VI, 8 [3]); if the author had expected an ideal highpriest from Levi he would have expressed himself differently[4]). Clearly the words υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ refer to Christ though it must be admitted that the title Son of God is by no means exclusively Christian [5]). This Christian interpretation is supported by the fact that the compassion of the Son is bestowed upon all the nations and by the reference to his crucifixion. T.L. IV, 4 reminds us of T.L. XIV, 1 where Christian influence is found. PHILONENKO objects to this Christian interpretation on the ground that this verse does not use the usual word σταυρόω, but ἀνασκολοπίζω. "Comment un chrétien aurait-il pu employer pour la crucifixion de son Seigneur cet ἀνασκολοπίσαι scandaleux?" The answer to this question is, I think, given by Paul who, in Gal. iii 13, quotes Deut. xxi 23 and calls Jesus Christ cursed because he hung on a tree [6]). It is quite

[1]) See *The Testaments*, pp. 125 f.

[2]) For the expression φῶς γνώσεως φωτεῖνον φωτιεῖς see, however, T.L. XVIII, 3, discussed on p. 207 above, where we found influence of Hos. x 12 LXX.

[3]) See pp. 210 f. above.

[4]) This verse presents PHILONENKO with a difficulty in regard to his exegesis of T.L. XVI, 5. He remarks: ".... l'auteur ne paraît connaître ici qu'une seule et unique Visite marquée par l'apparition du Messie".

[5]) With regard to Qumran PHILONENKO rightly points to 4 Q Flor. line 2, published by J. M. ALLEGRO, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXV,

conceivable that a Christian author (or redactor) deliberately used these words to express the horrible effect of the enmity of the Levitical priesthood.

Interesting is PHILONENKO's comment on *v.* 6: ὅτι ὁ εὐλογῶν αὐτὸν εὐλογήμενος ἔσται, οἱ δὲ καταρώμενοι αὐτὸν ἀπολοῦνται. The αὐτὸν is clearly the crucified one of *v.* 4. PHILONENKO quotes 1 QpHab. viii 1-3 (translating the expression ואמנתם במורה הצדק as "leur foi dans le Maître de justice") and remarks: "Ici, comme dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc* la foi qui sauve, c'est la foi dans le Maître de justice". First it should be pointed out that nothing in *v.* 6 suggests a "saving" faith in a particular person. Similar expressions occur in Jub. XXV, 22 (in Rebecca's blessing of Jacob), Jub. XXVI, 24 (in Isaac's blessing of Jacob), Jub. XXXI, 17 (in Isaac's blessing of Levi) and Jub. XXXI, 20 (in Isaac's blessing of Judah) and in none of these passages faith in the persons blessed is implied; nor is this the case in Gen. xii 3; xxvii 29 and Tob. XIII, 12. Secondly many commentators do not translate the expression in 1 QpHab. VIII by "faith in" but by "loyalty to" and I think this translation should, indeed, be preferred [1]). Though PHILONENKO's interpretation of either passage cannot be accepted, he rightly discovered parallelism of thought between T.L. IV, 6 and 1 QpHab. VIII, 1-3. It is clear from the writings of Qumran that loyalty to the Teacher and faith in God were much the same thing in the eyes of the sectarians! It is not at all certain, however, that this parallelism points to common origin; the same passage(s) from Scripture may have influenced both the author of T.L. IV, 6 and the sectarians.

1956, p. 176, where 2 Sam. vii 11 f. is applied to the expected Davidic Messiah. Text and translation of 1 Q Sa II, 11-12 to which he refers too, are, however, uncertain; see e.g. Morton SMITH, *New Testament Studies*, V, 1959, pp. 218-223.

[6]) In n. 71 on p. 21 PHILONENKO mentions 4 Q pNah. line 8 (J. M. ALLEGRO, *J B L*, LXXV, 1956, p. 91) where "one hanged alive on the tree" is mentioned. ALLEGRO refers here to Deut. XXI, 23 (so also VAN DER WOUDE, *Bijbelcommentaren en Bijbelse verhalen*, Amsterdam 1958, p. 58). From the context it is not clear, who is alluded to, and it is even improbable that only one particular figure was meant (see *v.* 7). It should be remarked that also the ἀποσκολοπίσαι which occurs in *b k* gives a good sense. This word means "to remove stumbling-blocks" (see LIDDELL-SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v.) and is used in this sense by AQUILA in Ps. lxviii 5; cxix 118; Isa. lvii 14.

[1]) See VAN DER WOUDE, *op. cit.*, p. 159 and H. KOSMALA, *op. cit.*, pp. 390 f.

'. Some passages from T. Benjamin, and T. Zeb. IX, 5-9.

The pericope T.B. IX, 2-5, discussed by PHILONENKO in his chapter IV [1]) which bears the title "Le prophète unique", presents us, like the preceding *v.* 1, with great textual and exegetical problems. Even the generally reliable MS *b* does not seem to give the original Greek text here.

In *v.* 2 we read πλὴν ἐν μερίδι ὑμῶν γενήσεται ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἔνδοξος ἔσται ὑπὲρ τὸν πρῶτον (text acc. to *a e f*) καὶ δώδεκα φυλαὶ ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Which temple is meant is not clear. We could think of an ideal eschatological temple after the manner of Ezek. xl-xlviii, if the text did not go on with the words ἕως οὗ ὁ ὕψιστος ἀποστείλῃ τὸ σωτηρίον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ μονογενοῦς προφήτου (*b k* om. προφήτου; *c* reads υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ in stead). Of this figure we hear in *vv.* 3-5: καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὸν πρῶτον ναόν (that of Herod? Is the πρῶτος ναός the temple that is now, in contrast to the one yet to come?) καὶ ἐκεῖ κύριος ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐπὶ ξύλου ὑψωθήσεται. καὶ ἔσται τὸ ἄπλωμα τοῦ ναοῦ σχιζόμενον καὶ καταβήσεται (so *b d k*; *c*, *a e f*, *g* μεταβήσεται) τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεου ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὥσπερ πῦρ ἐκχυνόμενον. καὶ ἀνελθῶν ἐκ τοῦ ᾅδου ἔσται ἀναβαίνων (so *b k*; *c*, *a e f*, *g*: μεταβ: *d*: καταβ.) ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς εἰς οὐρανόν. Ἔγνων δὲ οἷος ἔσται ταπεινὸς ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ οἷος ἔνδοξος ἐν οὐρανῷ.

To whom does the expression ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ μονογενοῦς προφήτου refer? PHILONENKO connects this with T.L. IV, 4 and finds the Teacher of Righteousness here too. He points to the expressions מורה היחיד in CDC XX, 1, יורה היחיד in CDC XX, 14 and אנשי היחיד in CDC XX, 32 where he translates יחיד as "unique" [2]). This translation is not the only one possible. VAN DER WOUDE [3]) rightly draws our attention to the parallel between the אנשי היחיד in CDC XX, 32 and the אנשי היחד in 1 QS IX, 10 (two passages which show more points of agreement) and supposes that יחד and יחיד are synonyms. But even if PHILONENKO's translation proves

---

The latter remarks that the commentator uses the word אמנה in stead of the אמונה of the Habakuk-text. "Das 'Festhalten am Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit' is nicht 'Glaube an ihm' im Sinne der christlichen Theologie, d.h. Glaube an die Person des Lehrers selbst, sondern ein getreues Festhalten an ihm inbezug auf seine Verkündigung und Wegweisung".

[1]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 22-24.

[2]) Comp. C. RABIN, "The Teacher of Righteousness in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?", *Journal of Jewish Studies*, III, pp. 127-128.

[3]) *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

to be the right one, it is still improbable that T.B. IX refers to the Teacher of Righteousness. This μονογενής προφήτης is called κύριος (a title which is not used in the writings of Qumran to denote the Teacher of Righteousness[1]). We are told that he "shall be lifted upon a tree"—a passage which must refer to Jesus Christ, if we take the parallels in the Testaments into account [2]). Moreover *v.* 4 which mentions the temple-veil is clearly Christian (comp. T.L. X, 3) [3]). PHILONENKO's comment on this verse is as unacceptable as it is ingenious: he thinks that this verse refers to an outpouring of God's Holy Spirit upon Pompey's soldiers who rent the veil and supposes that the author was inspired to such a far-reaching universalism by his hatred of the unworthy priests which served in the temple. In *v.* 5, too, we find Christian influence. As in his discussion of T. Zeb. IV, 1-4 PHILONENKO refers to passages in the Hodayot which, according to him, mention a descensus ad inferos of the Teacher. For criticism of this view see pp. 193 f. above.

Striking is PHILONENKO's interpretation of the phrase καὶ εἰσελευσέται εἰς τὸν πρῶτον ναόν. He does not think of a building (whatever that may have been) but refers to 1 QH VII, 4 where the author compares his body with a building. This verse he connects with 1 QH VII, 8-9 where, according to him, the community too is compared with a building. The speculations which we find here resemble the complex N.T. use of the metaphors "body" and "building (temple)" and PHILONENKO concludes, "Le premier Temple, c'est le Temple du corps humilié et outragé du Maître, son corps de chair. Le second temple, c'est son corps glorifié, son corps transfiguré, où se rassembleront à la fin des temps toutes les nations". We shall not enter into a discussion of 1 QH VII, but I should like to point out that nothing in T.B. IX justifies such an interpretation. In the beginning of *v.* 2 we read that the temple where the twelve tribes and all the Gentiles will

---

[1]) See p. 221 above.

[2]) See p. 223 f. above. Even PHILONENKO writes: "Il est difficile de ne pas penser aux formules johanniques". His remark that ὑψωθήσεται can be explained as an aramaism (זקף = "to lift up" and "to crucify") does not render support to his theory concerning the origin of the Testaments. The Johannine usage can just as well be explained this way (and has, in fact, been explained this way by a number of scholars, as Philonenko remarks himself).

[3]) Discussed above, on p. 222.

e gathered will be *in the portion of the sons of Benjamin.*

In his fifth chapter [1]) PHILONENKO deals with a passage which, ccording to most interpreters, deals with the apostle Paul: T.B. XI. Here too we are confronted with a difficult textual problem, ecause *vv.* 1-2a have come down to us in three different forms, iz. in *c*, βS, and A, and because *vv.* 2*b*-5 are only found in βS. In *The Testaments* [2]) I defended the view that the βS-text of *vv.* 1-2a s nearest to the original and that *vv.* 2b-5 form a later Christian ddition to an already Christian text. PHILONENKO declares, without argumentation, that the Armenian version has preserved the primitive text and assumes that the variants arose in the course of attempts to construct yet another prophecy concerning the Teacher of Righteousness [3]).

The parallels from Qumran which PHILONENKO mentions in connection with the Greek text of *vv.* 1-2 are of such a general nature that they cannot give support to his theory. He rightly refers to the parallels with Gen. xlix 27 (καὶ οὐκέτι κληθήσομαι λύκος ἅρπαξ and διαδιδὼν τροφήν) but does not consider the possibility that the fact that the quotation is given according to the LXX could point against Qumran origin [4]). The parallel with 1 QH VII, 21 is not convincing, especially as PHILONENKO does not mention any of the numerous passages in early Christian literature which consider Gen. xlix 27 as a prophecy concerning Paul [5]).

As parallel to the anti-jewish and universalistic *v.* 2 PHILONENKO mentions 1 QpHab. VII, 4-5; this passage speaks of the revelation of God's mysteries through the Teacher of Righteousness, but does not mention the nations. Neither T.L. XVIII, 9 [6]) nor T.B. XI, 2 can really be explained by somewhat similar passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls. PHILONENKO also points to Isa. xlix 6,

---

[1]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 25-27.

[2]) P. 34.

[3]) Comp. VAN DER WOUDE, *op. cit.*, p. 204: "Der armenische Text ist auch hier erheblich kürzer und am zuverlässigsten".

[4]) Hebr. וְלָעֶרֶב יְחַלֵּק שָׁלָל and LXX καὶ εἰς τὸ ἑσπέρας δίδωσι τροφήν Of the expression ἀγαπητὸς κυρίου in *v.* 2 PHILONENKO remarks that this is nearer to the Masoretic than to the LXX-text of Deut. xxxiii 12. This can, I think, neither be proved non disproved. See on the LXX-quotations also p. 186 and p. 195 n. 1 above.

[5]) See *The Testaments*, p. 122.

[6]) See p. 208 above.

which tells us that the Servant of the Lord will be a light to the Gentiles, but he forgets to mention where this text is applied to the Teacher in the writings of Qumran.

Finally, in *v.* 5 we find the phrase αὐτὸς ἀναπληρώσει τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς φυλῆς σου which may be called typically Pauline —comp. 1 Cor. xvi 17; 2 Cor. ix 12; xi 9; Phil. ii 30; Col. i 24 [1]). Again we come to the conclusion that the interpretation which assumes that the Greek text of T.B. 11 has been redacted by Christians is by far the most likely one.

T.B. X, 7-9 is discussed in PHILONENKO's seventh chapter [2]). This passage deals with the resurrection and the final judgment. The most important passages are . . . προσκυνοῦντες τὸν βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς φανέντα ἐν μορφῇ ἀνθρώπου ταπεινώσεως καὶ ὅσοι ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ γῆς συγχαρίσονται αὐτῷ (in *v.* 7), ... ὅτι παραγενόμενον Θεὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλευθερωτὴν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν (*v.* 8) and . . . . ὅσα οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ γῆς φανέντι (*v.* 9). In order to prove his supposition that in this passage also the Teacher of Righteousness is referred to PHILONENKO mentions the following arguments:

1) Besides τὸν βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς φανέντα he mentions as parallel Or. Sib. III, 47-48 τότ' ἄρ βασιλεία μεγίστη ἀθανατοῦ βασιλῆος ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι φανεῖται. The appearance of a kingdom is, however, not precisely the same as the appearance of the King of heaven Himself on earth. 2) The construction ἐν μορφῇ ἀνθρώπου ταπεινώσεως is typically semitic. But then semitic constructions may have been written by a Christian hand. 3) This "man of humility" is the Ebed Jahwe "dont le Maître de justice, comme nous le revèlent les Hodayot est la saisissante image". Is there, however, in the Hodayot or in any of the other writings found in Qumran a passage where the coming of the Teacher is described as the coming of *the King of heaven* in humble appearance? This seems to be a definitely Christian conception; it can certainly not be derived directly from Deutero-Isaiah. 4) The expression παραγενόμενον Θεὸν ἐν σαρκί betrays a more naïve Christology than that found in the prologue to the Gospel of John. This may be true but does not give us an argument against Christian origin

[1]) PHILONENKO mentions Corp. Herm. XIII, 1 in order to prove that this is not exclusively Pauline. Still, we may take this phrase as corroborating evidence for the theory that the present text of T.B. XI, 5 refers to Paul.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 31-33.

of this expression. 5) In the final judgment the attitude of Jews and Gentiles towards the man whom God sent on earth is the decisive criterion—to this we find a number of parallels in Qumran literature. The repeated use of πιστεύω, however, definitely gives an additional argument in favour of the Christian origin of this passage [1]).

In T.B. X, 8-9 the Israelites are judged first and the Gentiles are judged after them. PHILONENKO remarks that in 1 QpHab. X, 1-5 the order is different but he does not think that this is of any importance. I doubt whether this is true [2]) and should like to point out that the beginning of *v.* 10 καὶ ἐλέγξει ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν τὸν Ἰσραήλ shows a remarkable parallel with Matt. xii 41 f.

It is clear that the passages from T.B. IX, X, XI discussed here are Christian. The Christian redaction has been far more thorough than in some other parts of the Testaments and it is difficult, if not impossible to reconstruct the pre-Christian text [3]). The Armenian translation of these chapters is much shorter than the Greek text, but we cannot use it in our efforts to find the original [4]).

T. Zeb. IX, 5-7 is a typical Sin-Exile-Return-passage [5]) which warns especially against the sin of dissension: ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἀποστήσεσθε ἀπὸ κυρίου καὶ διαιρεθήσεσθε ἐν Ἰσραήλ καὶ δύο βασιλεῦσιν ἐξακολουθήσετε (*v.* 5, comp. the preceding *vv.* 1-4). PHILONENKO [6]) and other scholars regard this as a reference to the quarrels between the two brothers Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II which led to Pompey's interference in Palestinian affairs. We should notice, however, that after the return mentioned in *v.* 7 (and 8) *v.* 9 refers to a new exile: the sons of Zebulun are told that they will again provoke the Lord to anger and will be cast away unto the time of consummation. From the author's point of view the events mentioned in *v.* 5, therefore, belong to the past, and because the exile predicted in the S.E.R.-passages often shows traces of agreement with the Babylonian exile, it is quite possible

---

[1]) See p. 224 above.
[2]) See *The Testaments*, p. 127.
[3]) PHILONENKO also assumes that the (Essene) interpolator of the Testaments did his work so thoroughly in T.B. that we should not speak of interpolation but of redaction; see *op. cit.*, p. 5 and p. 7 above.
[4]) See *The Testaments*, pp. 33 f.
[5]) See *The Testaments*, pp. 83-86.
[6]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 6, 36 f.

that we must think here of the division between Israel and Judah after Solomon. The καὶγε πᾶν εἴδωλον προσκυνήσετε in the same verse may then refer to the idol-worship of various kings in Samaria and Jerusalem.

T. Zeb. IX 8 does not belong to the typical S.E.R.-pattern, but agrees in several aspects with other "Messiah"-passages in the Testaments [1]). The *b d g*-text is much longer than that of α, *a e f* A, S_1. In some other passages, too, the *b d g*-text is longer than that of the other MSS and it is not well possible to decide which of the two recensions is the original one [2]). PHILONENKO thinks that the *b d g*-text was written by a Jew who wanted to supplement the shorter text.

The main problem is, again: To whom does this verse refer? The central figure is called ὁ κύριος and this title is not used in Qumran to denote the Teacher [3]). As parallel to the beginning of the verse we may mention Mal. iii 20 (comp. T.L. XVIII, 4; T. Jud XXIV, 1); the parallel with 1 QH II, 8-9 mentioned by PHILONENKO is not convincing. No more does 1 QH III, 10 help us to understand the expression αὐτὸς λυτρώσεται πᾶσαν αἰχμαλωσίαν υἱῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκ τοῦ Βελίαρ. Probably this phrase, like T.D. V, 11 goes back to Ps. lxviii 19 and perhaps also to Eph. IV, 8 f. [4]). The words καὶ ἐπιστρέψετε εἰς τὴν γὴν ὑμῶν in α, *a e f*, A, S_1 belong to the normal S.E.R.-pattern and there is no need to regard it, with PHILONENKO, as reference to the future return of the sect to Palestine. The expression καὶ ὄψεσθε Θεὸν ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου in *b* (*d*) *g* is an expanded version of ὄψεσθε αὐτὸν in α, *a e f*, A, S it is definitely Christian [5]).

It is difficult to say to what extent T.Z. IX has been redacted but Christian influence is visible in the last two or three verses certainly in *b d g*, and possibly also in the other MSS (*vv.* 8b, 9).

8. *The eschatological meal*

In the often-quoted passage 1 QSa II, 11-12 rules are given for

[1]) See *The Testaments*, p. 91. [2]) See *The Testaments*, pp. 22, 3.
[3]) See pp. 221 and 226 above.
[4]) See, again, *The Testaments*, p. 91.
[5]) PHILONENKO writes: "Rien n'oblige à penser cependant que ces mo soient d'origine chrétienne. Nous avons trouvé en Benj. X, 7 une formu analogue et montré qu'elle n'était pas une interpolation chrétienne". A we could not accept his argumentation in T.B. X (see p. 228 above) w cannot follow him here either.

an assembly and a meal where the highpriest and the Messiah of Israel will be present. According to some scholars this meal is no other than the usual common meals of the community, for which 1 QS gives some rules. Others speak of an Essene eucharist, as prefiguration of the eschatological meal at the end of times. Also Also PHILONENKO accepts the existence of a "eucharistie essénienne" and he thinks he has found traces of it in the Testaments.

I do not think that the writings of Qumran which have been published so far allow us to speak of an Essene equivalent of the Christian celebration of Holy Supper [1]). Still, 1 QSa II, 11-22 speaks of a solemn meal at which the highpriest and the Messiah of Israel will be present and we have to ask whether PHILONENKO is right when he finds a similar expectation in the Testaments. He discusses a number of passages from the Testaments in his tenth chapter [2]) under the title "Le Messie at la Cène". He mentions a number of paralles, but finds one main difference: Here, again, the two messianic figures of 1 QSa have been united into one single Messiah, the Teacher of Righteousness.

The central texts are here T.S. VI, 7 τότε ἀναστήσομαι ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ εὐλογήσω τὸν ὕψιστον ἐν τοῖς θαυμασίοις αὐτοῦ ὅτι Θεὸς σῶμα λαβών, καὶ συνεσθίων ἀνθρώποις, ἔσωσεν ἀνθρώπους and T.A. VII, 3 .... ἕως ὁ ὕψιστος ἐπισκέψηται τὴν γῆν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλθῶν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων καὶ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ συντρίβων τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ δράκοντος δι' ὕδατος, οὗτος σώσει τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Θεὸς εἷς ἄνδρα ὑποκρινόμενος.

PHILONENKO considers the possibility that the meal is only mentioned to accentuate the real humanity of the Messiah (comp. T. Jud. XXIV, 1; T.D. V, 13; T.N. VIII, 3) but rejects this interpretation in favour of the one mentioned above. Is it really possible, however, that these passages refer to the Teacher of Righteousness?

In T. Sim. VI, 5 we read the phrase κύριος ὁ Θεὸς μέγας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, φαινόμενος ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος καὶ σώζων ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν Ἀδάμ. PHILONENKO finds here a number of semitizing expressions (ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἐν αὐτῷ, τὸν Ἀδάμ in the meaning of "mankind")—which may, however, just as well be written by a Christian as by a Jew. The expression φαινόμενος ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος

[1]) See e.g. J. v. D. PLOEG, "The Meals of the Essenes", *Journal of Semitic Studies*, II, 1957, pp. 163-175.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 38-42.

is clearly Christian—the only parallel mentioned by PHILONENKO is, again, T.B. X, 7-9[1]). Also the expression Θεὸς σῶμα λαβὼν is of Christian origin. PHILONENKO thinks that this expression points to a hellenistic background—in stead of ἐνσάρκωσις we find ἐνσωμάτωσις which presupposes, he thinks, the pre-existence of the soul—and he remarks: "On a souvent contesté qu'une telle théologie ait pu s'élaborer au sein du judaïsme et aux alentours de l'ère chrétienne: Au sein du pharisaïsme, sans doute, mais à l'intérieur de la secte essénienne de l'Alliance fécondée par l'hellenisme, de telles doctrines eurent la possibilité de s'épanouir". Unfortunately PHILONENKO does not prove that the possibility which he supposes became reality in the Qumran sect. Until this proof is given we shall do wise to regard Θεὸς σῶμα λαβὼν as a Christian formula.

In T.A. VII, 3 the expression αὐτὸς (= ὁ ὕψιστος) ἐλθῶν ὡς ἀνθρώπος will have to be regarded as Christian too. The phrase .... ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ συντρίβων τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ δράκοντος δι' ὕδατος is a reference to Ps. lxxiv 13: σύ συνέτριψας τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν δρακόντων ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος. The change of ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος into δὶ ὕδατος[2]) and the addition of ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ provide arguments in favour of Christian origin. Moreover there is an interesting parallel in Cyrill of Jerusalem, *Catech.* III, 11[3]) who teaches in connection with baptism that Jesus descended into the water of the river Jordan to kill the dragon: ἐπεὶ οὖν ἔδει συντρίψαι τὰς κεφαλὰς τοῦ δράκοντος (sing. as in our text, comp. Ps. lxxiv 14), καταβὰς ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν ἔδησε τὸν ἰσχυρὸν .... Finally there is the expression Θεὸς εἰς ἄνδρα ὑποκρινόμενος. CHARLES translates: "God, speaking in the person of man", and PHILONENKO: "Dieu parlant par l'intermédiaire d'un Lomme". One of the meanings of ὑποκρίνομαι is: "to reply, make answer" and "to expound, explain". The person who is answered or to whom the explanation is given is indicated by a dative. The usual meaning is, however: "to speak in dialogue, to play a part, be an actor" (the part played

---

[1]) See p. 228 f. and p. 230 n. 5 above.

[2]) MS *g* (as well as 3 MSS of the Armenian version) reads δι' ὕδατος. PHILONENKO accepts this as the original text and considers the α, β-*g* text as a Christian alteration. As a rule, however, *g* does not represent the original text when it deviates from the other MSS of the *b d g*-group (see *The Testaments*, p. 18) and therefore it is not likely to be original here too. Its reading must have been influenced by Ps. lxxiv 13.

[3]) Migne, *P.G.*, XXXIII, col. 441; see also *The Testaments*, p. 152, n. 222.

being put in the accusative), to deliver a speech" [1]). Here, in T.A. VII, 3, the translation "speaking to man" seems possible; the renderings given by CHARLES and PHILONENKO (who do not explain them) are most unlikely. How can the εἷς before ἄνδρα mean "in the person of" or "par l'intermédiaire de"? [2]) Another possible translation is: "God playing the part of man"—though the use of εἷς is not in conformity with classical usage.

Besides these two texts PHILONENKO mentions T. Jud. XXI, 5, T.L. VIII, 16-17 and T.L. VIII, 4-5. T. Jud. XXI is the chapter which speaks about the relationship between Judah's kingship and the much superior Levitical priesthood. Part of it has been discussed already [3]). We now turn to *v.* 5, where we read: καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν (i.e. Levi) ὑπέρ σε (i.e. Judah) ἐξελέξατο κύριος ἐγγίζειν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐσθίειν τράπεζαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπαρχὰς (α adds: προσφέρειν) ἐντρυφήματων υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. PHILONENKO points to 1 QSa II, 17 f. where the expression שולחן היחד ocurs. This is not a complete parallel, and it seems more likely that T. Judah XXI, 5 goes back to Ezek. xli 22; xliv 16 and Mal. i, 7, 12 where the expressions "my table" and "the table of the Lord" are used to denote the altar in the temple. Levi is allowed to eat of the firstfruits of the choice things brought by the children of Israel like the priests in Ezekiel's temple (see e.g. Ezek. xliv 28-31) [4]). There is no mention here of a common meal.

The same must be said of T.L. VIII, 16 where we read: . . . . καὶ ἔδεσθε πᾶν ὡραῖον ὁράσει, καὶ τὴν τράπεζαν κυρίου διανεμήσεται τὸ σπέρμα σου. In the following verse ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ κριταὶ καὶ γραμματεῖς are mentioned, as in Jub. XXXI, 15; they will belong to the tribe of Levi. The text continues: ὅτι ἐπὶ στόματος αὐτῶν φυλαχθήσεται τὸ ἅγιον which CHARLES translates as: "For by their mouth shall the holy place be guarded". The reading φυλαχθήσεται is found in *e, b d g k* and A, but *a f*, (*c*), (*hi*) read ληφθήσεται. The latter reading is preferred by PHILONENKO who writes, in connection with 1 QS: "C'est "sur l'ordre" des fils de Sadoq, des fils d'Aaron, des Nombreux, que l'on est admis à participer aux

---

[1]) See LIDDELL-SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. Especially in Homer and Herodotus this word is found as an equivalent of the Attic ἀποκρίνομαι (which is found in *g*).

[2]) This implies that 1 Q p Hab. II, 7-9 used by PHILONENKO to elucidate this passage does not offer a real parallel.

[3]) See p. 208 above.

[4]) See also the reference to this passage in T.L. II, 12.

différents stades de la vie de la Communauté" and he continues: "Il ne s'agit pas d'autre chose. C'est "sur l'ordre" des prêtres, des juges et des scribes que l'on prendra part ou non au repas sacré". As this passage T.L. VIII, 16-17 very likely belonged to Or. Test Levi (in some form) [1]) it is possible that something along the limes suggested by PHILONENKO was originally meant. It should be borne in mind, however, that it is not certain that ληφθήσεται is the original reading; that no meal is mentioned *expressis verbis*; and that T.L. like Jub. also mentions judges and scribes.

In T.L. VIII, 4-5 which belongs to a passage where Levi's installation as (high-)priest is described we find a.o. the phrase: ἐψωμίσεν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον, ἅγια ἁγίων.. PHILONENKO regards this as a reference to the wine and the bread of Essene holy meals. The expression ἅγια ἁγίων "est interessante, car elle souligne le caractère "sacramentaire" du repas". In view of the numerous other passages of Christian origin I still consider the explanation given on pp. 45 f. of *The Testaments* the more likely one. T.L. VIII, 1-10 describes a Christian baptismal ceremony, followed by the celebration of the Eucharist [2]).

Our conclusion will then have to be that neither the common meal of the Essenes nor an eschatological meal like the one they expected are referred to in the passages discussed in this section. In T. Sim. VI, 7 and T.A. VII, 3 a meal is mentioned only to accentuate the real humanity of the Messiah, in casu Jesus Christ. In T.L. VIII 4-5 we may think of a reference to the Christian Eucharist.

9. *Concluding remarks*

We have reached the end of our critical analysis of the theories put forward by VAN DER WOUDE and PHILONENKO. In view of the importance of the problem of the relationship between the Christian and non-Christian elements in the Testaments for the study of the New Testament and early Christianity as well as for the study of the writings and the history of the Qumran sect it was necessary to discuss their arguments in detail.

The present author has limited himself in the main to the apocalyptical passages of the Testaments because those were the ones discussed by the other two authors. For a full discussion of

[1]) See *The Testaments* pp. 45 f. and p. 211 n. 1 above.
[2]) See also my discussion of T.L. II-IV on pp. 46-49 of *The Testaments*

all problems connected with the relationship between the Testaments and the writings of Qumran we should also investigate and compare their views on angels and spirits, their ethical teaching and their attitude towards the worship in the temple. A beginning in this direction has been made by B. OTZEN and M.-A. CHEVALLIER in their publications mentioned in the beginning of this article, but much more will have to be done [1]).

---

[1]) See also my article in *Studia Evangelica*, pp. 555 f. In PHILONENKO's twelfth chapter (pp. 44-46). entitled "L'Archange" we find some remarks about the angelology of the Testaments and the writings of Qumran. In T.D. VI, 2 the children of Dan are exhorted: ἐγγίζετε τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ παραιτουμένῳ! ὑμᾶς and they are warned to take heed of Satan and his spirits (*v.* 1). The same angel is mentioned in T.L. V, 5-6. PHILONENKO recognizes him as the archangel Michael who is mentioned in the Latin version of Asc. Is. IX, 23 and 1 Q M IX, 15-16; XVII, 6-7. It is remarkable, however, that this angel is here called μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων. The same formula is used for Jesus in 1 Tim. II, 5. Michael is the guardian-angel of Israel, and also in T. Dan and T. Levi the angel just mentioned protects Israel—see ἐπὶ τῆς εἰρήνης Ἰσραήλ (T.D. VI, 2), ἐνισχύσει τὸν Ἰσραήλ (T.D. VI, 5), ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ παραιτούμενος τὸ γένος Ἰσραήλ (T.L. V, 6). But in other verses belonging to the same passages more people are included —see τὸν παραιτούμενον τοῦ γένους τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ πάντων τῶν δικαίων (T.L. V, 7), the expression μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων already mentioned and perhaps also πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους τὸν κύριον (T.D. VI, 3). The struggle between Israel and its enemies assumes cosmic proportions; it is a struggle between the servants of God and the powers of Satan. PHILONENKO rightly points to 1 Q M where we find the same. As parallel of the expression ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ ἐχθροῦ in T.D. VI, 4 he mentions ממשלת בליעל in 1 Q M XIV, 9 (comp. XVII, 5, 6 and 1 Q S III, 23; in *The Testaments*, p. 155, n. 271 I wrongly declared that this expression was not Jewish). There are also points of agreement with the well-known passage of the Two Spirits in 1 Q S III, 13-IV, 26.

I am not sure whether the more universalistic statements may be called Essene. It seems quite impossible, however, that T.D. VI, 6-7 was written by an Essene. Whereas in *v.* 4 we read: οἶδε γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ πιστεύσει Ἰσραήλ, συντελεσθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, *v.* 6 declares ἔσται δὲ ἐν καιρῷ ἀνομίας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀφιστάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν κύριος, μετελεύσεται ἐπ' ἔθνη ποιοῦντα τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ (for a discussion of textual problems, see *The Testaments*, pp. 35 f.; also PHILONENKO regards the text given here as original). Like other anti-Jewish, universalistic passage this verse will have been written, or at least thoroughly redacted by a Christian (see pp. 207, 227 above). See also *v.* 7: τὸ δὲ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι σωτήρ.. It is clear that in T.D. VI important parallels with views expressed in the writings of Qumran are found—but again Christian influence is visible.

[F. M. BRAUN O.P.'s article "Les Testaments des XII Patriarches et le problème de leur origine", *Revue Biblique* LXVII, Oct. 1960, pp. 516-549 appeared after the present study had been sent to the printers. I hope to discuss Father BRAUN's views in the next issue of this Journal. M. d. J].

SPIRIT-BAPTISM

BY

ERNEST BEST

The Manse Minterburn, Caledon N. Ireland

According to the Q (Matt. iii 11, 12 = Luke iii 16, 17) [1]), Marcan (i 8) and Johannine (i 33) traditions John the Baptist is regarded as prophesying that whereas he baptises with water there will be a baptism with the Spirit. The content of the nature of this prophecy in the different traditions varies considerably. Moreover in the tradition of Acts (i 5; xi 16) it is Jesus who prophesies the Spirit baptism. How have these different traditions arisen?

In the first place we must enquire whether John the Baptist did make any reference to Spirit-baptism. This is denied by the majority of modern commentators and scholars [2]). Where the statement concerning Spirit-baptism is attributed to John he is made to say that Jesus will carry out the Spirit-baptism, contrasting it with his own, professedly inferior, water baptism. In the tradition of Acts it is not said who will baptise with the Spirit. The grounds for doubting whether John made reference to such Spirit-baptism carried out by Jesus are briefly:

a. There is no reference in the Jewish tradition to the Holy Spirit as the gift of the Messiah; T. Levi 18 and T. Jud. 24 are exceptions but it is difficult to be certain that they are free from Christian influence. There is a wide expectation that the Holy Spirit is an eschatological gift but it is not directly connected to the person of the Messiah. It is unlikely that John made this connection: it must be attributed to the primitive Church.

b. The internal evidence of the tradition suggests that it did not originally contain a reference to Spirit-baptism. The Q tradition

---

[1]) We give this tradition the term Q. We assume Matthew and Luke used at this point a common source. For our purposes it is not necessary to discuss whether it existed in one or more recensions or what was the extent of the source.

[2]) Cf. the discussions of V. Taylor, ad Mark i 8; E. Schweizer, *TWNT*, VI, pp. 396f; C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, pp. 125f; M. A. Chevallier, *L'Esprit et le Messie*, pp. 53-57.

concerning John is much fuller than that of Mark; its picture of John fits into the Jewish background and there is no reason to doubt that in its general lines it is correct [1]). The Q tradition however links Spirit-baptism with fire baptism and this association is difficult. John summons men to a baptism of repentance at his own hands and prophesies the onset of eschatological punishment. His words are directed to Israel and he threatens that the moment of punishment will come when the Messiah appears, whose winnowing fan is in his hand and who will burn the chaft with fire (Matt. iii 12; Luke iii 17). He thus prophesies a Messiah who will cleanse Israel by a fiery punishment. It may however be argued here that John conceived the Spirit as a Spirit of cleansing [2]). The Spirit appears in this role in the Qumran Literature. In 1 QS 4.20f (cf. 1 QH 50.12 and 1 QS 3.6-8) God cleanses man by the Holy Spirit from all evil practices. This refers to a Spirit of cleansing but tends to exclude the idea of judgement, which also appears in the Q tradition; the latter might be considered a Spirit of cleansing in the sense of separation—separating the grain from the chaff. At this point there is another significant distinction between the Qumran references and the Q tradition; the former refers to the cleansing of the life of an individual, the latter is concerned with the judgement, or separation out, of a community; cleansing is used in two different senses. The Qumran literature cannot then be adduced as providing a suitable parallel in this connection. Moreover while the Q tradition contains within itself an expansion of the phrase 'baptism with fire' there is no similar expansion of the phrase 'baptism with Spirit', the implications of which would be redemptive rather than punitive. Accordingly the reference to the Spirit cannot originally have been present.

c. Acts xix 1ff suggests that the disciples of John the Baptist had heard nothing of the Holy Spirit. We cannot press this passage for it abounds with difficulties [3]); it is not certain that the reference underlying the tradition was originally to disciples of John; they assert that they have not even heard of the Holy Spirit; we may ask if such people could ever have lived in a Jewish environment at all.

[1]) Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Servant Messiah*, pp. 36ff; C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist*, pp. 4ff.

[2]) A. R. C. Leaney, *Luke* vi 40. Cf. J. E. Yates, *The Form of Mark* i 8b, *NTS* 4 (1958) 334-8.

[3]) Cf. Büchsel, *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament*, p. 141, n. 6.

We must now look separately at the different traditions. The Johannine account (i 33) with its precise identification of the person who will baptise with the Spirit as Jesus, not 'the coming one' as in the Synoptics, is undoubtedly secondary. Acts i 1-5, as the preface to the second part of Luke's two-fold work [1]), is manifestly a Lukan construction. Similarly xi 16, Peter's defence of his action in regard to Cornelius, is also a Lukan construction. However in the early chapters of Acts Luke had access to a cycle of tradition probably belonging to the Church at Jerusalem. It is therefore improbable that Luke himself attributed the Spirit-baptism logion to Jesus; this attribution lay in his source. In Acts i 1ff the logion is placed in the post-resurrection pre-Ascension period of Jesus' life. If during this period Jesus made some reference to the coming of the Spirit then it would appear likely that tradition recast his words into the phrase used by John the Baptist. In any case we must also regard the usage of the phrase in Acts as secondary. The account in Mark lies within a pericope (i 4-8) which is generally accepted as pre-Marcan [2]). The passage represents a fairly old unit showing Palestinian influence [3]). Similarly the Q tradition must be traced back to Palestine. Its vivid thoroughly Jewish detail argues strongly for its primitive character.

If we reject the view that John himself spoke of Spirit-baptism we must suggest some means by which this tradition arose and was accepted in the early Church. We may probably dismiss out of hand the suggestion of LEISEGANG [4]) that in Hellenism spirit and fire are connected [5]) and that accordingly spirit-baptism and fire-baptism are the same thing. The association of 'spirit' and 'fire' is not as close in Hellenism as LEISEGANG would suggest [6]) and such

---

[1]) On the 'Preface' see JACKSON and LAKE, *Beginnings of Christianity*, II, pp. 133ff.

[2]) Cf. K. L. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 18-22; R. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*, p. 261; the commentaries of TAYLOR, LOHMEYER, KLOSTERMANN etc., *ad loc.* Possibly v. 6 and ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (v. 4) should be excluded from the original form of the pericope as derived from the prophecy of i 2f.

[3]) A number of semitisms exist in the passage (cf. n. 2). Each may represent a possible Greek usage (cf. LAGRANGE *ad loc*) but their cumulative effect is such as to make this conclusion unlikely.

[4]) *Pneuma Hagion*, pp. 72-80.

[5]) E. g. POSIDONIUS says that the soul is πνεῦμα ἔνθερμον. Quoted in *Diog. Laertes* VII, 1, 84.

[6]) Cf. E. D. BURTON, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh*, pp. 74ff.

an explanation would remove the phrase from the strongly eschatological context in which it is placed in Q.

Bussmann reconciles the differing tradition of Mark and Q by assuming that his document G, which he claims formed the basis of Mark, was similar to Q in containing a reference both to baptism by Spirit and by fire and that Mark omitted the reference to fire [1]). This does not explain the origin of the reference to Spirit-baptism if John did not make it. It has consequently been argued that John originally referred to fire-baptism alone; that Q originally contained this alone; that either the reference to Spirit-baptism was added to Q as a Christian interpretation of what fire-baptism meant and that then Mark, who had access to the Q tradition at this point, omitted the original reference leaving only the interpretation; or that, more probably, independently of Q Mark represents Christian interpretation of what John said; this Christian interpretation was then read back and added to the fire-baptism of Q thus producing Q's present two-fold reference [2]). This involves a considerable degree of development of the tradition within a comparatively short period. John began by contrasting his baptism with that of a future baptism in fire by the Messiah; the means of the carrying out of John's baptism was water; the means of the carrying out of the Messianic baptism will be fire. This continued to be the tradition concerning John's teaching. Meanwhile baptisms were taking place within the Christian community and those who were baptised received the Holy Spirit; such baptisms were in the name of Jesus the Messiah; thus Christians were described as baptised with the Spirit; hence the origin of the Marcan tradition which was then added to the Q to produce the present form in Matt. and Luke [3]). But in so far as we can trace the primitive tradition it did not associate Spirit-baptism with Christian baptism but with Pentecost; again at xi 16 in the account of the conversion

[1]) W. Bussmann, *Synoptische Studien*, I, pp. 121f.

[2]) Cf. T. W. Manson in *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (ed. Major, Manson and Wright), pp. 332f; Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 116, n. 1; J. M. Creed, ad Luke iii 16f; A. E. J. Rawlinson ad Mark i 1-8; W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, pp. 19f. It would appear more probable that the addition of 'spirit' to 'fire' would have taken place while Q was developing rather than have been added independently by both the first and third Evangelists.

[3]) Yates, *op. cit.*, gives reasons to suppose that originally Mark i 8 did not conceive of the Spirit as given in baptism; the Spirit is the agent or means of baptism.

of Cornelius Spirit-baptism is referred to the descent of the Spirit on Cornelius which then leads to water-baptism; water-baptism is not itself Spirit-baptism; Pentecost, if it can be described as baptism at all, is a wind- and fire-baptism and not a fire-baptism alone. Thus it is difficult to make the transition through Christian baptism from fire-baptism to Spirit-baptism.

A preferable explanation is that originally suggested by EISLER [1]) and now widely adopted [2]). In this view tradition is correct in ascribing to John the word *pneuma* but wrong in giving it the meaning 'spirit'; it should be taken to mean 'wind'. The Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents *ruach* and *rucha* have also this double meaning. Apart from this word there is already a reference to wind within the Q tradition in the conception that the Messiah will use his winnowing fan to separate the chaff from the grain. Hence in the Q tradition *pneuma* as well as fire is explained within the context. Consequently John said originally that the Messiah would baptise with wind and fire. As fire so also wind is associated with judgement in Jewish tradition; e.g. Isa xxix 6; xxx 27f; xl 24; Jer. xxiii 19; xxx 23; Ezek. xiii 11-13; 4 Ezra xiii 10, 27. In Isa. xi 4, 'breath', which is another rendering of *ruach* is associated both with judgement and with the Messiah, 'and with the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked' [3]). Thus John's original statement with its double reference to wind-baptism and fire-baptism originally concerned eschatological judgement in which the wind would separate the chaff from the grain and the chaff would be burned with fire. Coming into Christian hands new depth was seen in the *rucha/pneuma* concept and this was given its alternative meaning 'spirit', thus changing the meaning from one of judgement to one of redemption. To 'Spirit' the adjective 'holy' was now added [4]). In this form the tradition existed when it came to be used by Matthew and Luke. Mark, or more probably the tradition on

[1]) R. EISLER, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, pp. 275-80.

[2]) Cf. BARRETT, *op. cit.*, p. 126; SCHWEIZER, *op. cit.*, p. 397; CHEVALLIER, *op. cit.*, p. 55f.

[3]) KRAELING, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-63, argues that John spoke of 'breath' and 'fire', God's 'breath' being connected, as in Isa. xi 4, with judgement. God's breath and his Spirit are more closely associated in thought than wind and Spirit. 'Breath' does not, however, fit as adequately into the context as does 'wind'; it is the latter which separates chaff from grain.

[4]) In Luke iii 16 there is some, though scanty, evidence for omission of ἁγίῳ—*Mss* 63, 64, Tert., Aug., Clem. Alex.—possibly suggesting an oral tradition in which it was at one time absent (cf. BARRETT, *op. cit.*, p. 126).

which he drew, wishing to emphasize the redemptive side of John's witness to Jesus, omitted from his account of John all that suggested that the Messiah when he came would be one who came in judgement, and so consequently omitted the reference to fire and thus produced the present text with its reference to Spirit-baptism alone.

It is not sufficient to say that the original tradition might have been modified in this way; it is necessary also to consider how the modification may have taken place. Since the Marcan tradition is Palestinian this does not allow a great time-interval for such a two-fold modification. Further the conditions under which *pneuma* would change its meaning from wind to spirit are difficult to conceive. The change must have occurred in Palestine during the period when there were many alive who had themselves heard John's words. Such a change would have been therefore under the continual scrutiny of a living tradition. It is not the kind of change, i.e. the change in the meaning of a word, which would normally occur in oral transmission. It is much more like the kind of change which someone who came on it without previously knowing it would make if he saw it in a written tradition. But it is extremely improbable that it was enshrined in a written tradition at such an early period, or that if it was written it would be come on by someone who was not used to the living tradition. If however some outside factor entered to disturb the tradition then the change might have been made.

Such an outside factor can be conceived. If we assume that the description of the events of Pentecost is not entirely a church tradition but embodies real details, and in particular that the references to the wind and fire are original [1]), then the process may have been somewhat as follows: John prophesied a baptism with wind and fire. In Pentecost we have an event in which there were both wind and fire. This must have been the baptism which John prophesied. But it was most decidedly an event in which the Spirit came on the Church; thus it was an event which could have been described as a baptism of the Spirit. There would then have

[1]) If on the other hand we suppose that 'wind' and 'fire' did not form part of the original experience of Pentecost but were read back into it because of John's prophecy, this supposes that John did prophesy about wind and not about the Spirit. However, in any case, this association of wind and fire with the Pentecostal experience must have been made fairly early (Luke is using Jerusalemite material at this point). Once the identification had been made the modifications would then have continued as we outline them.

existed from the beginning two traditions: 1. that John promised baptism with wind and fire; 2. (an interpretation of 1) that John prophesied a Spirit-baptism. The second was that which came to be used by Mark. This tradition now reacted on the other so that *pneuma* in it came to be taken as meaning 'Spirit'. It will be seen that this explanation of the origin of the two traditions fits in with the tradition of Acts which regards Spirit-baptism as connected with Pentecost rather than with Christian baptism. The tradition of Acts, which attributed the logion on Spirit-baptism to Jesus, may have arisen in a circle which knew only the original Q tradition describing the future Messianic baptism as eschatological judgement. This would obviously not be in accord with what happened at Pentecost, and so a prophecy of Pentecost was attributed to Jesus but in the terms of John's baptismal imagery.

It is also just possible that the outside factor which created the change in the meaning of *pneuma* was Jesus himself. There is the tradition of Acts that the reference to Spirit-Baptism came from him. His disciples and those of John obviously had contact. They must have known the logion of John in regard to wind and fire baptism. They may have asked Jesus about it and he may have replied to the effect that whereas John says 'wind', i.e. destruction, the true Messiah says 'Spirit', i.e. redemption. If he put himself forward as the Suffering Servant he may have felt called to correct the impression left by John. On the other hand Jesus did link his mission to baptism, 'I have a baptism to be baptised with' (Mark x 38f; Lk. xii 49f.), but baptism is here conceived under the terms of judgement [1]).

When John originally spoke of a wind and fire baptism he did not mean that the Messiah would baptise with water and that simultaneously there would be a baptism with wind and fire; rather the Messiah would baptise with wind and fire—a metaphorical use of 'baptism' [2]). The fulfilment of this was seen in the experience of Pentecost and in certain other exceptional experiences as that of Cornelius. Thus though there was water-baptism in the early Church with which, at any rate in the teaching of Paul, the Spirit was associated, this is not described as the baptism of the

---

[1]) Cf. G. DELLING, βάπτισμα βαπτισθῆναι, *NT*, 2 (1957), 92-115.

[2]) Cf. DELLING, *op. cit.*, who asserts that βαπτίζω only became a technical word in the Christian Church. In Mark x 38; Luke xii 49f it has the figurative meaning 'immersion'.

Spirit. Baptism was with water and to speak of baptism with the Spirit would have been to place Spirit and water on the same plane [1]) Where baptism is used with Spirit it must be taken in the figurative sense, whereas when it is used with water it is taken in the real sense of immersion, partial or total. Hence the phrase 'baptism in, with the Spirit' disappeared from usage, although the Spirit continued to be associated with water baptism. The phrase would not then have been a factor in the creation, say, of the Pauline baptismal theology.

REVIEWS

A. Th. Kassing, *Die Kirche und Maria. Ihr Verhältnis im 12. Kapitel der Apokalypse.* Patmos-Verlag, Düsseldorf, 1958. 176 pp., DM 22, 50.

Dans la dissertation qu'il a présentée pour l'obtention du doctorat à la faculté de théologie de Louvain, Dom Kassing cherche à éclairer le rapport existant entre Marie et l'Eglise; c'est dans cette perspective qu'il s'intéresse au ch. XII de l'Apocalypse. Voici le plan de son exposé: I. Questions préliminaires, concernant surtout l'herméneutique. II. Remarques sur le sens ecclésiologique du passage, sens généralement accepté. III. Remarques sur le sens mariologique. IV. La relation entre ces deux types d'interprétation. V. Fondement biblique de la vision de la Femme revêtue du soleil. VI. Parallèles bibliques de cette image. VII. Conclusions à tirer de cette exégèse pour le rapport entre Marie et l'Eglise.

Pour déterminer exactement la pensée de l'auteur, K. pense qu'il faut tenir compte du phénomène de la polyvalence des symboles. Il faut maintenir (contre Sickenberger) le sens ecclésiologique, qui vise l'Eglise des deux Testaments: le Peuple de Dieu dans toute l'économie du salut; la mère du Messie individuel n'est pas nécessairement une femme concrète, comme on le voit par plusieurs exemples, en particulier 1 QH III, 3-18. L'interprétation mariologique se heurte au sens natural des vv. 6, 13 et 14; mais elle s'accorde assez bien avec ce que le v. 5 dit de la naissance du Messie. Les exégètes donnent des explications fort différentes sur le rapport entre le sens ecclésiologique et le sens mariologique: Cerfaux, Braun, Le Frois, Colunga, De Fraine font appel au Protévangile, à la présence réciproque de Marie en l'Eglise et de l'Eglise en Marie, à la mentalité sémitique pour laquelle l'individu représente une collectivité, à l'analogie du rôle maternel de Marie et de l'Eglise, à un sens littéral complémentaire grâce auquel Marie est „adsignifiée" à l'Eglise. Ces explications ne satisfont pas K., qui en cherche une autre en analysant la manière biblique de concevoir le peuple de Dieu dans

[1]) The conception of 'Spirit' as an all-pervading presence in which immersion might take place would have been contrary to the ideas of the Jewish circles in which John, Jesus and the primitive chruch moved. 'Spirit' denotes divine force, divine intervention, divine visitation. Immersion in wind and fire is however more easily conceived. For the imagery of the 'river of fire' cf. Kraeling, *op. cit.*, pp. 115ff; Eisler, *ibid.*

son unité et la continuité de son histoire. Dans la pensée biblique, l'individu humain est homme en tant que membre d'un groupe (L. KOEHLER); en même temps, le peuple de Dieu a conscience de son unité, basée sur le fait qu'il descend d'un seul ancêtre, ou qu'il a été choisi par un seul Dieu. Cette unité s'étend sur les siècles, en sorte qu'en parlant de ses ancêtres, l'Israélite peut toujours dire „nous" (KOEHLER). „Pris en sa totalité, le peuple n'est ni une abstraction, ni une personnification, ni un concept universel; il est la réalité du peuple lui-même" (p. 107). Dans la tradition biblique (et ailleurs), le symbole ou l'image de la Femme n'est donc pas une personnification; elle exprime plutôt l'unité vivante du peuple réel. Cette image sert surtout à illustrer les relations existant entre Jahvé et son peuple; on l'emploie également pour expliquer la maternité du peuple élu.

Après ces explications, K. entreprend une exégèse détaillée des parallèles bibliques d'Apoc. XII: la femme qui est dans les douleurs de l'enfantement, symbole de la situation pénible dans laquelle le peuple élu se trouve dans son histoire ou dans l'ère eschatologique; la femme qui met au monde un fils, symbole illustrant dans l'Apocalypse le *Christusereignis*. Développant le htème biblique des souffrances du peuple élu concrétisées dans les douleurs de l'enfantement du Messie lui-même, 1 QH III, 3-18 constitue en quelque sorte le pont entre l'A.T. et l'Apocalypse johannique.

Le dernier chapitre relit le ch. XII à la lumière des résultats obtenus par les études précédentes. Dans la première phase de la vision, vv. 1-4, il n'y a pas lieu d'identifier la Femme avec Marie: les dimensions de l'image sont plus larges. Mais au v. 5, la mère du Christ prend dans cette image la place qui lui revient comme membre le plus important de la totalité vivante du peuple de Dieu. Non qu'on puisse distinguer deux sens différents: la Femme est le peuple de Dieu, et c'est pourquoi, au moment de la naissance du Messie, elle est avant tout sa mère, Marie. Le v. 17 met l'accent sur la maternité spirituelle de l'Eglise, qui est en même temps, d'une manière analogique, celle de Marie. Ces explications se confirment si l'on considère les autres passages du NT qui, parlant de Marie, le font en la mettant en connexion avec son rôle dans l'économie du salut: toujours même passage du concret et de l'individuel à la perspective ecclésiale et universelle.

L'argumentation de K. est sérieuse, toujours bien appuyée sur les textes. En concluant que le sens mariologique du ch. XII est simplement *inclu* dans le sens ecclésiologique, il décevra peut-être certains théologiens; d'autres apprécieront une prudence qui recommande son exégèse à l'attention.

La typographie est soignée; les fautes d'impression sont rares.

Tyniec (Pologne) A. JANKOWSK